

**BLM Wild Horse & Burro Advisory Board Meeting**  
**August 25, 2014 - Afternoon Session**

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Okay.

Welcome back, everybody.

Welcome back to those who are following us LiveStreaming.

Okay.

So I'm Kathie Libby.

I'd like to welcome you back to the BLM wild horse and burros national advisory board meeting.

This is our public comment period.

All parts of this session are important.

This is extremely important, and we have a large number of people - we have 46 people, yes - who wish to make comment, and we want to make sure each and every one of you gets to do that.

We have one hour and a half, which means each individual will have two, count them, two minutes.

You will come when -- when I say your name you will come to this microphone.

It works a little better than the one we were using this morning.

You will have two minutes.

I will be here.

When you have 30 seconds left I'm going to give you signal.

Then when the two minutes is over, you will hear my phone sing a little song.

You will know it is time for the next person to get up and speak.

We've done -- many of us have done this before, and I know you're all very respectful of each other.

Sir, you're not going to be able to put your camera there.

This is the camera space right here, and that's a camera space right there.

The reason is we need people to be able to walk in and out without getting injured.

Okay.

So let's get started.

Anything, Boyd?

>> B. SPRATLING: If you give who is on deck, you know, so they can be kind of positioned to come up to the table.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: I can do that.

I can do that.

I'll give you the first three names and then when those three -- then I'll say that again, but -- so I'll give you three at a time.

Okay?

So we are going to start, and I will not always read your handwriting correctly, or

pronounce your names correctly, and for that I apologize beforehand.

We're going to start with Carly eversole.

We are then going to go to Kim Michaels.

And then to Meghan LALLY.

Is Carly -- come on down.

You are going to be at that microphone right there.

Right over here.

>> Okay.

I'm Carly eversole from the eversole ranch in Sweetwater county.

We are 65 miles southeast of Rock Springs right in the salt wells, adobe town area, involved in this checkerboard BLM conflict.

I just want to talk a little bit about my family's history with the horses and make some points about how I think they're such -- there's such a gap between how people view the rancher and the range.

I don't understand a lot of these advocacy groups are sprouting up and talking about how the ranchers wild the wild horses off and things like that, but what needs to be said here is that the rancher can't function without the range.

So having said that, I mean, we need the range to function and to thrive in order for our livestock to make a living for us.

My family personally, we have -- we're running about 150 fewer head on our permits because of the sake of the range, because of the grass and the water and everything else, and there's a lot of groups out there, including the BLM, that have not taken a pay cut or anything like that in the size that my family's taken in order to preserve the range.

So I think I represent a lot of ranchers when I say that that the horse problem, the reason that the numbers need to be managed, is for the sake of the range, so that we can all run out there together.

We've had a lot of conflict with the horses overrunning.

They have been chewing up our cattle.

They teardown fences.

They have become a real menace.

And a lot of the ranchers don't want to see the wild horses completely removed, but the numbers to be managed, like a lot of livestock producers do in my area just for the sake of the range.

Right now that's not being done.

They're overrun and they're very destructive.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Now we have Kim Michaels.

>> Hi.

Good afternoon.

I'm Kim Michaels and I'm here representing the cloud foundation.

I'd like to start out by telling you that I come from many generations of farmers and ranchers.

I truly understand what it means to earn a living from sustainable agriculture.

My family was very respectful towards the stewardship of their land.

They carefully rotated pastures.

And they never took on any more livestock than their land could handle.

I want to express my deep concerns over the permanent removal of wild horses in the checkerboard complex.

I am completely opposed to the use of taxpayer dollars for these unnecessary roundups.

In 2013 \$70 million of the taxpayers' money were spent on helicopter roundups and private holding pens.

And let's not forget that there's currently more wild horses in holding than there are on the land.

Our public lands can no longer support large amounts of livestock grazing.

Welfare ranchers pay only \$1.35 per head per month for public land grazing, which is a stark comparison to the cost of private grazing permits averaging anywhere from 12 to \$18 per head per month.

I am calling on the BLM to perform a full review of the grazing program, including the number of permits and the cost of the fees.

Please let America's wild horses stay free.

H thank you.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you, Kim.

Thank you very much.

And now we have Meghan LALLY.

>> Hi.

My name is Meghan O'Toole LALLY and I represent ladder livestock company.

We have a ranch in southern Wyoming and northern Colorado in the adobe town area and the areas surrounding it.

We've seen devastating impacts, not just to our grazing, but to the wildlife habitat and the amount of wildlife that we see on our ranch and on the lands we graze on as a result of wild horses.

When I was little, we would drive around our ranch and we'd say, oh, look, there's a wild horse.

Now my kids go, oh.

I mean, they went from being something amazing and neat to something that is so destructive that my children don't like them.

My daughter was attacked on our ranch by a wild horse stud.

And if my brother hadn't been there to drive it off, she would have been hurt or killed.

And when we told the BLM we wanted that wild horse stud removed from our ranch,

they told us, "we don't have the money, and it happens again, shoot it."

We said, can we get that in writing?

They said, "no."

So, commit a Federal crime or watch your children get hurt.

We have adopted a lot of wild horses over the years, and we use them every time on our ranch.

They're wonderful horses.

No rancher I know is advocating getting rid of every wild horse, but it is very important to keep the population so that the ranchers and the other wildlife, deer and elk and antelope and sage grouse have habitat also.

Thank you.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you very much.

And our next three speakers in this order are Pete Morey, Barbara sunlaid and Juanita BurtonSEL.

Thank you.

Pete?

>> I'm Pete Morey and actually I come from Nevada.

So it's a little ways away from here.

But something interesting in Nevada, I think wild horses are counted in thousands rather than in hundreds, and current population in Nevada is approximately double the amount that BLM estimates can exist in balance with other public rangeland resources and uses.

I'm also a member of the Nevada board of wildlife commissioners, and I recently had the opportunity to tour a public land allotment to observe impacts of the resource by horses.

We were accompanied by BLM personnel to answer questions and give us an historic background on that allotment.

Livestock grazing was removed from the allotment a few years prior to our visit.

We arrived at a water source to see wild horses watering or trying to water.

At one time this spring was fenced with a pipeline and troughs outside the fence to supply water for a modest amount of horses, livestock and wildlife.

What we found was a group of horses trying to water out of a small slurry, muddy slurry puddle, and that was the only water available.

There wasn't enough water there to supply the horses, let alone the wildlife.

The ranching community is fully aware of the possible listing of the sage grouse as threatened or endangered and how it would have a huge impact on industry and our local economies.

The wild and free roaming horses and burros act has provisions to solve the overpopulation.

Difficult decisions need to be made soon to prevent the thresholds from being crossed

that we heard about earlier.

Thank you.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you, sir.

And Barbara.

>> Oh, I have so far to go.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Two minutes is not long.

>> Mine isn't that long.

So...

As you well know, as the Bureau of Land Management, a study by the National Academy of Sciences to review and evaluate previous wild horse management studies and the findings resulted in a report entitled using science to improve the BLM Wild Horse and Burro Program, a way forward.

The report included a number of recommendations, chief among them, the need for transparency, the need for scientific research, and the need for public participation in the decision-making process.

It also said the public needs to have access to the data used and the data and methods must be scientifically defensible.

To date the BLM has yet to act on those recommendations, and clearly has no intention of doing so in the future.

The BLM recently brokered a deal with local ranchers to remove more than 800 horses in Wyoming's checkerboard region.

There was no plan for the public to provide input and no scientific environmental study was conducted to support the need for removal.

This is yet another example of the BLM's history of underhanded, illegal actions, lack of transparency, and complete disregard for the well-being of current and future generations of our wild horses and burros.

The destruction of our public land is not due to wild horses and burros, but from the cattle and sheep owned by private ranchers who refuse to take responsibility for the long-term damage they create.

And the gentleman who, I think, is behind me who provided the analysis, it seemed to me that the report was pretty much one-sided in terms of horses.

So if it's done again, I'd really like to see the cattle and sheep included.

John mentioned prison training centers but didn't mention the one in Cañon City.

It's been -- in Colorado.

It's been very successful and, in fact, is the flagship location for the program.

Thank you and you're welcome.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you.

And Juanita.

>> Thank you.

I'm glad to be here.

My name is Dr. burtonsel.

I'm from Wyoming, grew up in Rock Springs in the Sweetwater county.

My family was here as ranchers and started ranching in 1915 and was here in 1907.

So I have a broad also historic history.

When I was a young woman I saw a beautiful band of about 200 horses with their foals running, manes, tails flying.

It was the most beautiful thing that still I hold in my memory, and I've not been able to see that since.

There are 3.6 million acres of public land.

There's lots of room.

The BLM administers 80 grazing allotments with he 318,647 permitted active animal units.

Currently there are only approximately 45,000 animal AUMs and they don't count the Cavs until they're six months old.

So you're looking at what, 45, 65, 75 or more thousand cows.

And I'm struck with the fact there is a lot of land and that's a lot of cows and they're out there in terms of forage for five months out year, and they dismiss it in the forage studies saying, that's not a big deal because they're only there five months.

But the prime time for the forage to be green and ripe.

The horses have to eat through the snow with the wildlife through the winter, and then when it comes in, then the cows are taking over.

It is really of a great concern.

I think it's very important that the wild horse gets a fair shake, and people be honest, step aside, there can be compromise, there can be -- if all the energy you put in today could go towards keeping the horses on the range and solving the problem, we'd all be way, way ahead.

Thank you.

[ applause ]

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thanks to each of you.

Sorry about that.

I think it was telling me it was time to stop.

The next three individuals are Linda HANNICK, Dick Loper, and Jerry treblecock.

You kind of recognize your name.

List.

>> My name is Linda HANNICK.

I am from Colorado, and I also represent the cloud foundation as a board member of the cloud foundation.

I want to thank you for the opportunity for us to give our public comments.

This is important to everyone on these issues.

I want to say a quote appear young woman who is a rancher in elk mountain Wyoming

wrote this morning.

She's a great wild horse advocate.

We have more to learn from the animals than the animals have to learn from us.

And I think I -- that sticks in my head a great deal because of who this young woman named Becky is and how she thinks and admires and works with the wild horses.

My background is I'm an educator.

I have been a middle school teacher, a high school teacher and a junior college teacher.

I've owned a successful small business for a couple dozen years.

I look at this from different eyes and different stand points.

But the underlying thing which I'm really glad to hear today as we're talking about on-range management, and I've seen this shift.

I've come to it from a fiscal standpoint, a humane standpoint, and following the 1971 law.

And on-range management would save us a lot of money, we would have fewer injuries, and wild horses would continue to live with their families in a natural environment.

We have several herds that have a lot of people that document them.

The most famous one is the Pryor herd where cloud lives.

As a specific statistic, we had 172 adult horses in the Pryor herd this year.

We've had 15 foals born, and then five adults die.

That gives us a growth rate of 8.8%.

Why is that 8.8%?

Because it's a very successful PZP program, and it has only gotten better.

I challenge the board to look at this as an example that we can do this on other herds and there are people out there willing to volunteer and do this as they are in the Pryors.

Thank you.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you, Janis.

And Dick Loper?

>> Thank you very much.

I'm Dick Loper from lander, not too far from here.

I'd first like to thank very much the board for coming to a small town in the west.

We've been asking you for quite some time if you would be willing to do that.

We very much appreciate your coming out here where the horses and people live that are impacted by whatever decisions that are made.

So we'd encourage you to continue to seriously think about places in the small town west where you could come.

It didn't cost me \$4,000 this year to come to a board meeting, and I very much appreciate that plus we appreciate you coming out to our part of the country.

Thank you.

I'd also like to continue to encourage you, your work groups I think are quite appropriate work groups, I'd like to see the work groups be much more active and aggressive and maybe find some ways to include some of the rest of us in at least some of the input to some of your workgroup discussions.

If that would be possible.

We'd like to make sure that our horses are managed under the multiple use concept, that there's enough room for everybody, and there in fact is.

Some you on the tour I think recognized that there is room for appropriate number of horses, livestock, wildlife and also the health component of the land.

The no gather policy of the BLM at this point in time is somewhat understandable, but I can tell you as a range manager trained in range science that we cannot survive three to five years of an ineffective horse management program.

So redouble your efforts if you would, please, to try to help BLM come up with some real solutions that will help the health of the land and the multiple use users on these lands.

Family ranchers do need your help.

Wildlife needs your help.

And the horses need your help.

They need to live in a Humane Society and environment out there.

Thank you.

[ applause ]

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you very much.

And now we have Jerry treblecock.

>> Good morning afternoon.

My name is Jerry treblecock.

I serve as Executive Director for [inaudible] Conservation District here in Lander.

On behalf of the Conservation District Board of Supervisors I'd also like to thank you for hosting your meeting in our rural community.

The Conservation District is one of three districts in Fremont county.

We're one of 34 districts in Wyoming.

And we're one of 2,986 districts nationwide.

By law we are charged with the conservation and enhancement of our soil and water resources to stabilize our farming and ranching communities, to preserve wildlife, public lands, and our local tax base.

We support multiple use of our public lands and active management that balances horses, livestock, wildlife, recreation for healthy, productive rangelands.

The Conservation District supports equipping our public land managers with tools based on the best available science, to maintain population sizes, to Appropriate Management Levels.

We support adoption to remove horses from the range.



Last week we participated as a sponsor for the Mustang days at the Wyoming state fair with an educational display that promoted sustainable rangeland health and balanced multiple use relationships for our public lands.

We support the utilization of fertility control measures to reduce the reproduction rates and timely gathers to keep populations within AML.

Thank you for providing us an opportunity to comment.

I'd also like to share with you one of our flyers that promotes our position of balance.

Thank you.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: We'll take those flyers in the back and make sure that the board gets them.

Thank you.

Next we have Rick Meyers, Gillian Lyons and Robert PLISKIN.

Is.

>> Rick Meyers is my name.

Again, I will I will reiterate the fact that personally glad you guys decided to have a meeting where we didn't have to travel to a big area a long way away from Wyoming.

I'm an individual rancher and also a member of the Wyoming state grazing board.

I've followed the BLM's plans for handling wild horses for the last 20 years, and I will say hats off to you guys in a lot of respect because you have tried, but it's real hard to try when you've got advocate groups against you, you have a budget that fluctuates quite a bit.

Here recently the cost of feed and the cost of housing these horses in long term and short term facilities is not working.

There's an old saying, if it's not broke, don't fix it.

But I'd say right now it is broke, and we need to fix it.

And I think earlier today, I'm going to pick out John Falen, John Falen brought the point up that we need -- the bottom line is to go to the source, and the source is the mares and stallions on the open range.

We need to put more money toward developing reproductive ideas to where we can control birth rate.

I remember reading a deal here not long ago that said that out of the money that was appropriated last year in 2013 that the only -- only 1% of that money was used for reproductive studies.

If PZP doesn't work, get something that does work.

Thank you.

>> Hi, everybody.

I'm Gillian Lyons.

I work at the Humane Society of the United States.

We are concerned that instead of focusing resources on the implementation of the NAS act that the BLM is spending some of their resources pursuing proposals unrelated to

NAS recommendations.

For instance, proposals to send animals overseas, including a proposal to send up to 100 wild burros to Guatemala in coordination with the Department of Defense and Heifer International.

Domestic wild burro adoption numbers call into question the need for this kind of pilot project within the United States particularly because such a project requires multi-agency coordination and taxpayer funding.

In 2013 the BLM adopted out 192 more burros than it removed from the range, a clear signal that domestic adoption rates are healthy.

Further, humane organizations are helping place burros in homes throughout the United States.

In fact, my organization, the Humane Society of the United States, has a project which has helped place 129 burros in 2014 and has placed over 200 since its inception in 2013.

As wild burro adoption numbers are strong in the United States we are concerned that this pilot project is a precedent to start shipping wild horses and burros overseas instead of focusing on the development and implementation of fertility control programs in the United States.

Our research conducted in conjunction with the BLM shows just how effective and economical fertility control implementation can be, and bear with me, I'll read these numbers to you.

Our research has shown that 58% of untreated mares produce foals during the 2012 and 2013 foaling seasons.

But annual foaling rates for 49 mares that received PZP boosters by dart in 2010 averaged at only 23%.

Among the PZP treated groups the mares boosted with PZP-22 did the best with an average foaling rate of only 16%.

In just to finish that off, the basin study has also shown boosters of PZP can be effectively and efficiently delivered by dart.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you very much.

And Robert PLISKIN.

>> I am Robert PLISKIN.

Maybe I get the prize from coming the farthest.

I'm from Middlefield, Ohio.

I used to be a volunteer for the Wild Horse and Burro Program.

Here's my badge.

I was a compliance officer for about eight years out in California.

I also have a bachelor's of science with distinction from the University of Arizona in natural resources.

My major was watershed management.

I was a hydrologist and a firefighter for the Forest Service.

Just to get back to reality of numbers, I want to reiterate that roughly 350,000 head of cattle number that we heard, which is a BLM figure, we heard it earlier in the comments, and what I heard was the 45,000 AUM livestock figure in the checkerboard versus 1,912 horses, which I was given as a BLM figure.

Then to consider Dr. Petersen's presentation where if you would have had a cattle exclusion and a cattle inclusion or a livestock exclusion and livestock inclusion versus an exclusion, what the bar graphs might have looked like given the relative ratio of that number of horses AUMs to that number of cattle AUMs.

And, listen, we all do belong on the range together like people on all sides have been saying so far, and I just want to interject that note of reality.

We've been asking -- I've heard the board ask the question repeatedly or make the statement, we need to look at what if anything do we need to do differently.

I'm going to read this from my passport.

It's a quote by Dwight Eisenhower.

It says -- I lost the page -- whatever America hopes to bring to pass in the world must first come to pass in the heart of America.

This is the heart of America, and when I take this to do a presentation about wild horses in Poland next month, it's going to be hard for me to talk about these numbers.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you, Robert.

>> Thanks.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you.

[ applause ]

Next, three individuals or Annie McHale, Paula King and Simone Netherlands.

We'll start with Annie.

>> Good afternoon.

Thank you for letting me speak.

My name is Annie McHale.

I'm a citizen of the wonderful state of Wyoming.

I live in Cody.

Most of my wild horses are running wild and free.

However, I understand that there is an association called the Rock Spring Grazing Association that wants to remove all of my horses from my public lands.

Wyoming features the Mustang as an important part of tourism, the second largest industry for my state.

What if they're all gone?

Please advise the BLM that zeroing out our Mustangs is not the right move.

If horses are causing issues, isn't Wyoming a fence-out state?

Why don't we require the landowners to fence them out?

Natural selection in nature's way of rubbing the world, nature can manage my horses

far Bert than I've seen BLM manage them.

The despair, death and inhumane treatment in short and long-term holding facilities is against nature.

If the wild horses were left out on my land, nature would prevail and would make far more sense than spending taxpayers' money on shade studies.

\$5 per day to house a recently captured wild horse doesn't make sense.

How come the livestock ranchers only pay \$1.35 per month when I have to pay \$5 a day?

We do allow -- why do we allow cattlemen associations to graze on my land without my permission when out east cattlemen own the land or lease from private landowners and pay at least 10 times the BLM collects?

Please do the right thing as an effort -- listen to good advice and let our wild horses run free and let nature take its course.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you, Annie.

[ applause ]

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you, Annie.

Paula King.

>> Hi.

I'm Paula King.

I came here from Taos, New Mexico to talk to you today.

I was very happy when I heard Callie bring up range degradation.

And I was very happy to hear Dr. Petersen talk about range management.

That is very near and dear to my heart.

I'm a stakeholder in the rangeland.

I'm a taxpayer.

And what I cannot understand is the complete rhetoric about overpopulation of wild horses, not just in Wyoming but across the West.

As a communications Director for the cloud foundation, I follow what is written about wild horses all over the United States.

There is a rhetoric out there of an overpopulation which is not true.

When there are over 356,000 head of livestock -- or head of cattle and about 45,000 head of sheep, and the three HMAs that are designated to be zeroed out, as compared to only 1900 wild horses, it sometime ease my imagination to understand how those 1900 horses can cause so much rangeland degradation.

I wish that someone could make me understand that.

I learned in grade school how to count.

I still know how to do that.

I have gone to the BLM's rangeland administration system, which is cryptic, not user-friendly, but I worked my way through it, and hours and hours spent doing hard research, and let me tell you, we need to look at the number of cattle and sheep out

there as opposed to the number of wild horses before we make decisions to remove horses.

Thank you.

[ applause ]

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you so much.

You're fast.

>> I was prepared.

Hello.

Hello.

Is this working?

Can you hear me?

Nope.

I don't think it's working.

This process is still not working.

It is broken.

This program has been broken for a very long time.

And still no one has stepped up to fix it.

I'm using this analogy again because it seemed that it was remembered.

Tim, you remembered it, and that from came your suggestion to actually have a team look over the comments and do something with it.

To actually give a response to proposals and ideas that are submitted, and we appreciate that, and we hope to see that go somewhere.

Because all of us, not just wild horse and burro people, the cattle ranchers, everyone does a lot of effort to come here and give you their comment.

What happens to our comments?

How do you process those?

We never hear anything about that.

We don't want them to end up in the trash.

The word "cattle" in this meeting seems to be a forbidden word.

Slides come that portray damage that supposedly wild horses did to the land but no one ever comes up with a slide of damage that cattle did to the land.

Ever.

The word is never mentioned.

There is a pretense in this room that we do not have cattle on those same public lands out there, and it is really, really ridiculous.

We need you to actually make a recommendation to the BLM to ask that they make their forage allocations more fair between cattle and wild horses and burros.

You are supposed to protect wild horses and burros by law but you are not supposed to protect cattle ranchers by law.

If cattle ranchers only had 26 million acres left where they were allowed to ranch, we

would have a fair debate.

[ applause ]

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you, Simone.

The next three commenters are Ken Brown, Carole Walker, and Susan Sutherland.

>> I just acquired your pen, Kathie.

Ken Brown, western counties alliance.

Thanks for the opportunity to respond.

Not much different information than the last meeting.

WCA continues to support a wild horse burro program on public lands with proper management.

Excess numbers continue to be a major problem in most areas where WHB animals now exist.

Excess numbers continue to cause resource damage and create impacts to livestock and wildlife habitat.

WCA continues to support the reintroduction of disposal facilities which are necessary to care for animals in need.

State land managers and private rangeland owners continue to express concern about WHB animals roaming on land under their jurisdiction which they do not support.

WCA continues to support an enhanced gathering process which will assist in reducing numbers.

WCA continues to not support transplanting WHB animals to areas where they do not now exist.

Mr. Chairman and board, staff, thank you for your continued efforts and good work.

[ applause ]

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Carole Walker?

>> Hi, my name is Carole Walker, and I'm a board member of the wild horse freedom federation.

I've also been photographing wild horses in the red desert in adobe town, salt wells, great divide basin for the last 10 years and I spend a lot of time driving out on those roads and observing the horses, and I've also seen cattle and sheep out there on the land, too.

And this recent announcement of the BLM to round up and permanently remove 806 horses from the checkerboard without an Environmental Assessment, without any opportunity for the public to comment is really targeting and supporting one special interest group, not mixed use.

You're acting as though on the checkerboard there is only private land.

There is private and public land, and the proper process needs to be observed for rounding up and removing horses from public land as well.

I would like to see -- I would like to see some other way of dealing with the horses on the checkerboard than targeting them and saying that they are causing all the

destruction.

I have been out in adobe town last year, and there were sheep in April just as the grass was coming up, and then I came back out two weeks later and there were cattle, and there was no opportunity for the grass to come in and grow and establish itself.

So I say that blaming all of the range degradation on the wild horses is a farce.

And to round up and remove 806 horses right now when there isn't even room for the existing horses that we had the whole crisis of these 1500 mares moved to a feedlot where 80 of them have died so far, where are you going to put these 806 horses is my question?

And it is very cruel and inhumane to bring them in and to have them living out their lives not with their freedom and their families.

Thank you for listening.

[ applause ]

>> Thank you very much.

Thank you.

I'm sitting down now.

>> I'm a wild horse adopter and taxpayer from Illinois, and first of all, I would like to thank everyone here, whatever capacity they're in, that work positively, constructively, cooperatively to protect and preserve viable wild horse and burro herds on public lands.

As far as comments, I'd like to start with -- I wanted to bring up the fact that it would be very helpful for the advisory board to take the National Academy of Sciences results seriously and I was very encouraged to hear comments to that effect today.

I also wanted to bring up the request to work cooperatively with all Americans, not just public land ranchers who would like to see horses removed and also people such as [inaudible] adopters who ship truck roads of Mustangs to slaughter.

We did hear reference to research looking at the various stakeholders.

That's encouraging as well.

I wanted to bring up the situation with the horses in holding in Palomino Valley and Fallon where it's extraordinarily hot.

Many people are trying to get answers on what's happening to those horses and any effects since many people volunteered to acquire and construct facilities, and so the shade for compromised animals is encouraging, but the compromised animals alone, I would think the heat contributes to being compromised.

So you're kind of -- we're not getting to the root of the issue.

So I'd really like to go beyond the studies as far as that situation goes.

A couple comments relating to this morning.

There's references to horses need to be removed because they're above MLAs.

I've never seen any science to what's created an MLA.

They are arbitrary in any fashion I can research.

So the argument to remove them above those numbers doesn't hold a lot of water when you compare them to the statistics to livestock on the range.  
I'd also like to get a copy of Dr. Petersen's article as fast as I can, although I would like to see the comparisons with cattle on those factors.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you very much.

[ applause ]

Thank you, Susan.

The next three, Lisa FREIDE, Suzanne [inaudible] Kathie Breyerly and Suzanne Roy.

>> Good afternoon.

Thank you.

It took me 26 hours to get here, so pay attention.

Pay attention to this wife of a cattle rancher.

Pay attention to my countless emails.

Pay attention to my countless suggestions that come from all over the country.

Pay attention to the offers of assistance, financial and otherwise.

Miss Guilfoyle, you said you didn't want any financial assistance from anyone that was -- that had a lawsuit against you.

We wouldn't have lawsuits against you if you paid attention.

Pay attention to the act of 1971, no harassment of horses.

Pay attention to rangeland health.

Animal density.

87%, 13%.

I'm not really good at math, but 87 is a bigger number than 13.

Pay attention to common sense.

Did we really need a study about shade?

I mean, come on.

Season after season we've requested shelter for these horses.

Pay attention.

Winter is coming.

Are you going to do a wind break study?

For God's sake, pay attention to the horses, the condition of the horses, before you ship them.

Come on.

Pay attention to the elephant in the room that no one has mentioned... the counties that if they implement the resolutions, the county resolutions, it will take the managing of wild horses out from the Federal government.

Look at iron county officials that are trying to pass or go above the 1971 act and have the wild horse oversight act, HR5058, that is a huge, huge elephant.

So pay attention.

Don't let this pass or you're going to lose your wild horses.



Pay attention to my suggestions.

My husband pays over \$18 a month for horses.

I'd like to pay \$200 a month for an AUM and put 150 horses back on my hand, please.

Pay attention.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you, Lisa.

[ applause ]

>> Thanks.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Kathy?

>> My name is Kathy Breyerly from Colorado, and I'm a wild horse adopter.

A come of days ago one of my friends sent me this graphic of how much a cow calf pair eats compared to certain wildlife.

This kind of fits in with Dr. Petersen's.

There's not horses on here.

And I'm not a Ph.D., but I'm kind of confused about the one AUM of a cow-calf pair equals a 1.25 of a horse.

I looked on the Internet on average a beef cow weighs 12 hundred pounds and eats 2.5% of its body weight, and that makes about 30 pounds -- this is dry forage.

So 30 pounds of dry forage.

On the other hand, a horse weighing a thousand pounds eats about 1.5% of its body weight, or 15 pounds per day.

So according to just looking to see what cows eat as opposed to what horses eat, it seems to me that horses eat less.

We can talk about how they graze and things like that that are different, too, but I know how much my neighbor feeds his cows and I know how much I feed my horses and it's a lot less.

So the solution to this problem, I'm speaking specifically about the Rock Springs grazing areas, the solution to this problem to me seems if we need to remove 800 wild horses, instead we could remove 400 cow-calf pairs.

The rancher only pays the BLM \$1.35 per cow-calf pay.

So the BLM would only be losing \$540 per year, and we wouldn't make just one rancher suffer, we would spread out the 400 deduction among 20 ranchers.

That would be a reduction of 20 cow-calf pairs per rancher.

That seems reasonable to me considering the Wild Horse and Burro Act does specifically state that one way to maintain that thriving natural ecological balance is to reduce the number of livestock grazing within the wild horse management area.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you very much.

[ applause ]

Are you going to take those back upstairs?

>> No, I'm giving these to you.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Perfect.

You can leave them there for a minute so people can see --

>> KATHIE LIBBY: For a visual.

>> Yes, thank you.

Hi, I'm Suzanne Roy, Director of the American wild horse preservation campaign.

I've come today to deliver the petition signatures of 40,000 citizens who oppose the roundup of wild horses in the checkerboard area near Rock Springs.

These people had to sign this petition because the BLM gave them no opportunity for public comment on the roundup because the agency completely avoided NEPA, ran roughshod over NEPA and the wild horses act in proceeding with this roundup.

The signatures were collected in just over a month, testimony to the strong public support for protecting our wild horses.

Since we only have two minutes I want to focus on perspective and solutions.

Nationally wild horses occupy just 11% of the BLM land that's available for livestock grazing.

Horses are restricted to 26 million acres, and thanks to Zack Reichold from the BLM we now know that about 80% of the forage in the Herd Management Areas goes to livestock instead of wild horses.

In Wyoming we have 3,700 horses approximately on 3.6 million acres.

That's one horse per thousand acres.

Hardly an overpopulation problem.

We hear a lot about sage grouse.

There's 16.2 million acres of sage grouse habitat identified in Wyoming.

1700 grazing allotments.

51% are not meeting rangeland standards because of livestock grazing.

Wild horses are present on just 15% of sage grouse habitat.

So where are we going to focus our efforts here if we want to save the sage grouse?

The hyperfocus on nonexistent wild horse overpopulation diverts attention from real problems and real solutions.

And those solutions are humane fertility control using what you have now instead of waiting for a future magic bullet, land trades to create contiguous habitat in checkerboard areas, and a fairer allocation of resources for wild horses in designated Herd Management Areas.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you very much.

[ applause ]

The next three are Rob PROTHS, Meghan Crawford, and John RIDALSNIK.

>> Did you say me?

>> My name is Rob PROTHS.

I appreciate you coming to rural Wyoming to have your meeting and going out on the tour and the ground that was partially on our private land where you stopped and state and Federal Lands how they're intermingled in this deal with the horse issue, I think

that's very important for you and I.

I appreciate you taking the time to get a little more understanding how this works out here in the lander complex.

I'm going to speak fast since we have two minutes.

I'm going to do my family came here in 1883.

Homestead on Sweetwater southern Fremont county.

Migrated from Rock Springs.

I appreciate the comments that not seeing the horses, but we ranched here 50 years before BLM was established.

There was no horses other than the ranch horses.

We know how their origin, how they got here.

We're not against there are some here.

My thing I want to impress upon you the most today is that they need to be managed.

You take when 1971 when the act was passed in the lander complex area we had less than 20 horses.

That's between the Rawlins highway and Shoshone.

At our utmost time with the system we have we were over 800.

Now, we're not saying that, look, we have livestock and the balance of people have this issue with.

We have less livestock now than we've ever had the public land but we have to manage the horses, we can't go from 20 to the 800 rebound.

That's the issue I wanted you to focus on today, is we need to manage.

Pie wanted you to go outside the box, think like HSUS which is not a word in the ranching community but what's wrong with controlling puppy mills, cat mills.

We've got a horse mill going here, folks?

Proper neutering, spaying out there.

I don't have any problem with the release, the system the way we do it.

Let's go over this one-fix time vaccine or that to take care of this population control.

Let's get real, folks.

We've got this problem.

We've got some boundaries.

We need to face the facts.

Look, this is equine.

We've got canine, feline.

We just need to really focus that, look, we accept that we have -- we're here when there wasn't any.

We know the origin.

Just need a new approach.

We can all have this conversation consensus, and that's to collaborate and get this thing behind us so we can go on.

Thank you very much for opportunity to comment.

[ applause ]

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you very much.

Meghan?

And we are 32 minutes and maybe another 20 people away from the end of the period.

So let's please honor the amount of time we have.

Thank you.

>> So I'm here today as an adopter.

I have three mustangs at home.

One of them was adopted through the Cañon City program at the correctional facility, that they do there.

It's a wonderful program.

The other three are from the extreme Mustang makeover.

I encourage you to keep funding these programs.

They find horses homes, and that's the bottom line here.

I also encourage you to implement a possible Volunteer Program.

All the people here want to contribute.

They want to see the horses on the range.

I encourage you to try to get a program nationwide where you go to herd areas specifically and improve water conditions.

Maybe remove fences that are no longer necessary.

We want to see the horses, and we want to see them thriving, and this is something that the public can contribute to.

I also believe that -- you know, we've heard a lot about the conflicts involving grazing and the horses.

Sit possible some herd areas could become wildlife refuges.

Make it a place where only wildlife are on.

This doesn't just affect the horses.

This is good for the land.

This is good for the wildlife.

Make it an area where there is no grazing, no mining, no oil and gas.

There's not many areas left like this in the United States.

And also these industries, grazing, oil and gas, they're going to be here, regardless of what happens at this meeting.

However, the wild horses may not.

We're just asking for a little consideration.

Thank you.

[ applause ]

>> My name is John.

I was a contract veterinarian and worked at the Rock Springs processing center for

about 20 years.

I was witness to the changes from paint brands to deer tags to unreadable freeze brands be a foregoing microchips for reasons unknown to me.

In other words, I've seen the good, and the bad and the ugly.

I [inaudible] with the problems with the too many horses when the sanctuaries first started and in fact saw then the fenced areas that they are now.

The new ecosanctuaries are being proposed are just admittance of failure for the sanctuary system.

Adoption is dead under the present cost of feeding and caring for the horse and wild horse act.

My personal acquaintance with these horses started many years ago when I was a kid south of the Rock Springs.

We had four or five of these little horses which were used as replacements.

We managed the breeding as well as the nutrition.

This is all ended in 1971 when the feds took over.

The wild horses now that we have in Sweetwater county were mostly turned loose horses from five or six ranches both south of and north of Rock Springs.

Brings ranch, Rife ranch, and Kaley's grandpa, Roy Eversole, Chilton, Jewell, Blair and hey and another one -- and Aaron Belts.

These are the -- it's highly unlikely that any of these horses are descendants of Spanish horses brought to the country or real mustangs rather than just ranch horses.

But there's still a trace of the old thoroughbred line following the remount program in the -- started by the U.S. Army and mostly in the adobe town area.

To continue with horses in Sweetwater county I would propose a set of sides pieces on the ground on the north side of the interstate running from about point of rocks east for about 20 miles and making it a 400 square mile.

The other one would be on top of White Mountain that is being proposed by two landowners in the area.

This would fit in with the -- a lot of people who want a place to put their horses all by themselves.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you, John.

Remember what your wife.

>> One more thing.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: I was going to ask what was in that bag.

>> Here is a solution to the unwanted horses and -- and horses in the sanctuaries.

15,000 makes 16 million meals.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Please sit down.

Thank you.

Thank you.

Next we have Ginger Katherines.

Go sit down.

Christie Chapman.

Lois Herbst.

>> How do you follow that?

Easily she said.

Hi, I'm Ginger Katherines.

I'm Executive Director of the cloud foundation.

I've been studying wild horses for 20 years on the range and I come from a livestock background.

When I was in college I knew more about cattle than I did anything else, and, gosh, can you just hear the frustration in this room?

It's palpable.

And I had prepared remarks but, what the heck.

We have to get our act together where we talk to each other.

We have to have more than a two-time BLM advisory board meeting where I sit on this side of the table and you guys sit up there and Boyd can look so nice and friendly, and not -- everybody can nod occasionally or grimace.

We've got to get some kind of a plan where we can work together.

This is just not working.

I mean, when the cloud foundation offered free wind protection for the horses in the Rock Springs corrals in winter and we were told that the solution from BLM was to do a thermoregulatory study of horses, that's just not -- I mean, what kind of a response is that?

That we're going to do a study?

We're going to do a programmatic EIS that takes 2.5 years or something?

Is that going to solve any of our problems and all of our differences?

There are livestock people in this room, conservationists, naturalists, cow people, horse people.

And we all can work together.

I just know we can.

But we have to have a methodology to do that.

Tim, can't you make a suggestion?

About how we have an opportunity to talk to each other?

Dick Loper knows a lot more about range than I do.

I know a lot more about wild horses and how to do PZP darting than he does.

Together we can have solutions that work opinion.

>> I'm Christie Chapman and I feel weird here because I come from a lot of different backgrounds.

I've worked for the BLM.

I come from a ranching family and I'm a wild horse advocate.

I'm also the founder of an animal welfare organization in carbon county called caring, learning, connecting, rescue and rehab and we focus on small animals right now but our mission was written to incorporate large animals at some point and our focus wanted to be wild horses.

To that effect because we reside and serve in carbon county and parts of sweetwater and Fremont which contains several of the HMAs, we have a great interest in these horses and management.

And I spend a lot of time out there with the horses on a weekly basis.

I'd like to say that I'm referring specifically to the horses in southern Wyoming with the suggestions I have.

I'm glad to see this board is looking in that direction.

I heard a lot of things here today that were very encouraging.

in the checkerboard to attract the -- to attract the horses to the BLM sections.

I think that through developing water sources, building the bait traps and using minerals and other things the horses can be attracted to those sections.

I'd like to see darting for the PZP and some safety improvements for horses, cattle, and human interactions.

Mineral X road runs right through the creek and lost creek.

There's one -- and there's heavy use of that road due to energy development.

And with citizen involvement there could be more signage warning of the areas of that road where the horses congregate and also the cattle.

There have been fatalities on that road for the animals.

And I'd also like to see more research specifically regarding genetics to improve the herds but also on behavior in wild horses and how that can be used to manage the forage.

And things like that.

>> KATHIE LIBBY: Thank you very much.

[ applause ]

[ captioner switch ]

>> Hello.

Thank you for being here.

I operate a ranch that I married into about 56 years ago.

I'm the lone survivor right now, you might say, and I lease everything out.

We have BLM districts in three -- we have lands in three BLM districts and in three different counties.

And our land is 50% private.

But we have state and federal lands involved also.

We have no horses for which I'm very thankful.

But I work with the Wyoming state grazing board.

I'm a member of the lander district.

And we hear all the problems with the wild horses and we make the tours as you did yesterday

out to green mountain and the granite open especially where they have really been hit. I think it's a control mechanism for land and water and you know that we're being hit with wolves, grizzlies, the sage grouse.

I am in a sage grouse core area where they will manage the private land and everything. Even though they say they don't.

You have to have a permit for everything you do.

And that involves management.

But my friends have had to reduce some of their herds by 50% and I don't think that -- we use these lands out here.

You can't equate horses and livestock.

We produce a product that is needed.

44% of all the beef produced in the United States spends some time on federal lands and we have quality beef compared to the east even.

Is that it?

Oh, constitutionally, my rights aren't protected when they wrote the Endangered Species Act. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much.

And our next three are Jim Penzion, William Le Baron, and Marjorie Graham.

>> Good afternoon.

My name is Jim Penzion.

I'm speaking on behalf of the Rocky Mountain elk foundation and 203,000 members nationally and over 10,000 in Wyoming.

We're a member of the national horse and burro rangeland coalition an advocate for common sense ecologically sound approaches to managing horses and burros to promote healthy wildlife in rangelands for future generations.

The REF is very concerned about the overpopulation of horses and burros on western public lands.

We remind the board that these animals have not native and have no natural predator.

When overpopulated they damage natural range and impact all native wildlife including sage grouse, elk and mule deer.

They also impact other legal issues of our public land range.

Fairly horses and burros can be particularly destructive on watering holes and wildlife are run from these critical areas.

We're also very concerned about the ecosanctuaries in the western United States to address overpopulations.

These are not long-term solutions and again will impact native wildlife.

We call on Congress and the BLM to use any and by all means including capture and removal as well as fertility control to move horse and burro populations to levels required under medical law.

Thank you -- federal law.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

>> Great. Thank you.

And you were just a big help by the way, Jim.

Because we have about 15 more people so it's going to 15 minutes longer than we anticipated.



I apologize.

So as quickly as we can get up and down, that's would be great.

>> Thank you for providing me with the opportunity to make a statement.

My name is William Le Baron, I'm representing the Public Lands Foundation which is a member of the national rangeland management horse and burro coalition.

And I wish to offer the same public land foundation comments for the record that was presented at the last board meeting.

Public land foundation members have thousands of years of experience in managing national resources and no one in the foundation receives pay for foundation work.

Our comments to the board and the BLM today will be limited to population growth suppression.

We applaud the BLM for its March 2014 requests for applications.

RFAs to alert veterinarians, scientists universities, pharmaceutical companies and other researchers of growth suppression methods.

We hope that this RFA will produce results designed to help to control the overpopulation of Wild Horse and Burros on federal public lands.

However, we are concerned that any products of the RFA will likely take years, if not a decade before they have an impact on populations.

There does not appear to be any management activity that is dealing with the fact that the wild horse and burro populations are continuing to grow in largely unfettered manner.

There's little room for debate that the impacts on the increasing numbers of horses and burros grazing year round are adversely affecting rangeland conditions with a resultant negative impact on wildlife, soils and water resources.

The public land foundation has on numerous locations requested that the BLM convene a group of wild horse veterinarians and other appropriate scientists knowledgeable about the long-term fertility control drugs and that the group be charged with making recommendations for immediate long scale use and field study for long-term fertility control drugs along with recommendations for managing herd behavior.

>> Thank you.

Thank you for the opportunity.

>> Yes, please.

Marjorie -- while Marjorie is coming up, I'm going to give the next three names so you can be out of your seats and ready to go.

Next after Marjorie is Doug Thompson and Sandra Lee followed by Marjorie Farrabee

>> I thank the board for me the privilege to make a comment today.

Our ranch has been into the family since 1891.

We -- as we have always put the land first.

That is our livelihood.

We have always managed and worked with the game and fish.

And with the wild horse people.

We have never, ever wanted all the wild horses off our land, private and public.

We want management.

We want management of the cattle.

We want management of the wildlife.

We want management of the wild horses.

We want management of all living species.

We have two or three different allotments, the big pasture is one that do carry wild horses.

We have a deeded land intermingled with the private and state land.

We have had problems here with the wild horses getting in to our deeded land and we rotate our pastures.

To try to conserve.

We have 20 head of horses when this first started out we have two.

Had two.

Well, they populate and in the time periods we have -- they have the federal land

Owners have removed these horses at times.

We are now up to 20 head again.

They could not remove some of them because of the terrain.

But at three years ago we started asking to please remove these 20 head.

We were informed that due to the lawsuits and money, we cannot remove at this time

>> Thank you, Marjorie.

>> Thank you for listening.

>> Sorry, you understand our situation.

>> Doug Thompson.

>> Yes.

>> Thank you for being here.

I serve as chair of the Fremont County Commission which I've done for 14 years.

I'm a rancher in the area you toured yesterday.

I serve on the Governor's sage grouse conservation team and the BLM RAC and helped develop the land resource management plan.

From those perspectives, I can tell you right now that nonmanagement, delayed management or ineffective management because of bureaucratic plans and waste of money is going to lead to a worse problem.

You won't correct anything.

I urge you to consider your programmatic EIS. That tends to lead to one size fits all.

My experience is the best resource management is closest to the resource and we have plans in place in Wyoming and in lander, resource management plan sage grouse conservation plan.

Urge you to use all the tools available, especially population control.

Adoption, ecosanctuaries and long-term holding will not solve a problem that's making it worse.

I encourage you to look at partnerships, state of Wyoming and our counties are ready to step in to support research and management options in the state of Wyoming. We took the sage grouse management by the horns and have a good plan.

We can do it with horses.

But it has to be done close to the resource in a cooperative manner with interested people who are interested in solutions not fighting and litigation.

With that, I thank you for coming to Wyoming and wish you well in your efforts.

Thank you.

>> Thank you very much, sir.

[APPLAUSE]

and Marjorie.

>> Hello, thank you for this opportunity.

My name is Marjorie Farrabee and I'm director of wild burro affairs for wild horse freedom federation.

In addition I'm equine manager for Todd mission ranch and T MS rescue in Kansas and we also have cattle.

What is different about us as opposed to our subsidized cattle people is we have to pay for our hay, we paid for our land and to pour salt into the wound we pay taxes that subsidize cattle ranchers, it's a little unfair, don't you think.

We have 348 donkeys, 46 of those are wild burros removed from freedom.

It never fails to amaze me how Regal.

They are.

Many come from different HMAs and have a distinctive look.

Our burros from Mojave are tall and big boned.

Twin peaks are big boned and filled with dark hair and those from the tribal represent rainbow of colors from pitch black and gray.

Although no longer free, they still take my breath away to watch them.

They truly are different from our domestic donkeys, even once they've been chained with due to their naturally curious nature is easy to do, they remain ever alert and poised in demeanor.

They were born wild and are inherently wild as native equine given protections through the unanimous decisions made by Congress in 1971 our wild horses and burros are supposed to be given principal grazing rights on the land where they were found.

Principal means 51%.

Currently livestock out numbers our wild horses and burros 100:1.

BLM is in direct conflict with the meaning of the 1971 act.

The land does next slide animal impact but it is about timed grazing.

Wild horses and burros will move easily with forage and availability.

Cattle do not.

Cattle must be managed to mimic the great bison and wild equine herds of the past.

This is how we can manage our lands is holistic range management

>> Thank you very much.

I apologize if I skipped over Sandra.

So Sandra is next.

>> Hi, we met last April.

I'm Sandra Selly.

I'm from Seattle, Washington.

Took me two days to get here.

Delighted to be here.

My background is in organization management development.

I've worked for 35 or 40 years with large corporations in how to implement change, how to put in new management systems, and how to take action which I'm hearing as a theme today.

I'm hearing two themes.

Let's take action and let's do it collaboratively.

Let's work locally with all the constituencies, let's put teams together and work this stuff out.  
I happened to sit in on a group in southeast Oregon, there's a model being tried.

Collaborative consensus decision making group.

I have great hopes for it.

All the constituents that stayed in the room and are duking it out.

It's how we can get solutions.

So with background in mind, I want to specifically speak with Joan and Greg for a minute.

My experience is working with high level managers and executives and it's in getting plans in place that are focused on action.

Okay?

And so I'm hearing folks today really want action and I also have been trained well in my working with upper level executives and how to keep things simple.

So I've got three simple priorities.

Well, first of all, first of all, I really encourage you to get three action-oriented managers.

And give them each one of these priorities to make it done.

I've worked in manufacturing and production and build airplanes and get rockets to the moon.

I know we can get this done. Okay?

It's not rocket science.

Priority number one and we're hearing it loud and clear is immediate 100% on the range management.

And I won't go into all the subdetails but establish those volunteer local groups.

This January 2015 start the PZP.

Ginger tells me January to April or May is the only time it will be effective.

Don't waste your money on other times of the year.

Get it done this year.

Get as many mares done -- (tone)

You've got to be kidding, number 2 priority is zero out the short-term holding and zero out -- and number three is zero out long-term holding and put a different person in charge of each one of those.

>> Great, thanks so much.

I apologize to everyone for two minutes being so short, but it just is.

In this order next three Jonathan Brant, Nicole Kibbard and Jeannie Barnes.

Two minutes each.

>> Good afternoon, everyone.

As you can tell by my accent, I'm not from Wyoming.

I grew up in Israel and I currently live in Colorado.

My background is evolution and animal management.

I have a Ph.D. from Indiana university.

Today I want to talk to you about things I'm hearing about chemical vasectomy as a potential tool for population control.

At sand wash basin in Colorado.

I'm concerned this is not the best means of population control and that it's far inferior to what is already in place and being worked on.

Mainly the PZP.

And most of the information I gleaned about this is from the National Academy of Sciences report from last year.

So the number one problem I see is that this is not a method that has been studied in equines as of 2013.

I'm not sure if there's anything new out yet.

The number two problem is that you effectively control populations by means of treating stallions, you would have to treat almost all of the stallions which would pose an extinct risk and loss of genetic diversity on the herd.

The number three problem is that gatherers would have to be implemented to treat the stallions.

And number four problem is that -- the problem of late season births in the wild horse herd would be greatly expanded using this method.

Thank you very much

>> Thank you very much.

Is this Nicole coming to the table?

Good.

>> Hi. My name is Nicole Rivard, and I'm here with Friends of Animals but I'm also here just simply because I love horses.

We at Friends of Animals believe it's a crime that today there are more wild horses trapped in miserable holding facilities approximately 47,417 than living free on the range.

There are currently only about 41,000 roaming free on public lands advisory board members gathered in Riverton here today should not be discussing how many horses to round up or stabilize but instead focused on how to ensure there is a healthy and viable population of wild horses for future generations to see.

Earlier it was mentioned that ecotourism contributes greatly to Wyoming's economy as it does in other states.

The BLM should be encouraging ecotourism, not destroying it.

The key to viability is having adequate horse numbers and enough habitat so there could be some exchange between herds.

The majority of today's herds are not capable of having genetic variation to prevent extinction.

The BLM needs to stop sticking its head in the sand ignoring recent scientific evidence regarding the wild horses and reintroduced natives we establish that evidence in our petition to get horses protected under the Endangered Species Act.

While little is known about the relationship of wild horses and prehistoric North American species, at the time the Wild Horse and Burro Act was passed in 1971.

Today the record is clear the modern horse originated right here in North America about two million years ago and evolved here before being killed off by early humans and environmental conditions.

We owe it to these horses to save them from being wiped out again by the very agency charged with protecting them.

Thank you.

Jeannie.

>> Hi, I'm Jenny Barnes. I'm also with Friends of Animals.

I came from Colorado and I'm here to ask the board to recommend that the roundup be

stopped until the government has time to review information about the viability of our last remaining horses.

There's not too many wild horses and as has been said multiple times cattle far outnumber wild horses on our public lands.

As Nicole just explained, wild horses face serious threats from their small herd size, the restricted habitats and the continued roundups.

This is why Friends of Animals along with the Cloud Foundation submitted a petition to have wild horses listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act.

This could and should change the way the government handles wild horses and mandate that this amazing species being protected and not removed.

While I'm not here to regurgitate the Endangered Species Act I'm here to urge that you recommend BLM stop all efforts to remove wild horses before the government gets a chance to make a finding on this petition.

The Endangered Species Act requires the government to make initial finding in the next coming months and a final finding by the end of the year.

This petition presents serious factual and legal issues that need to be resolved regarding wild horses before BLM starts rounding up the last wild horses and removing entire herds from the state.

At the very least the board should recommend the BLM stop any actions to round up wild horses until the government has an opportunity to review the information.

The BLM and the advisory board should change the way it looks at wild horses and the solutions available.

It is time to stop considering wild horses a problem to be involved, contained, or managed and time to start considering their true status as a native species that needs to be protected.

Thank you.

>> Thank you very much.

Next we have Adiyta Burkehart, Pat Sheehan, and Kathie Meyer.

>> Hi, everyone.

I'm the campaign director for Friends of Animals. And we're an international animal advocacy organization founded in 1957.

And I came all the way from our New York office to be here.

We believe it's time to end the BLM and rancher's criminal actions on wild horses on America's public lands and listing wild horses which the BLM falsely claims are nonnative despite the scientific evidence under the Endangered Species Act would provide much needed regulation to halt further exploitation of this species and end the brutally cruel roundups that rip the horses from their families and the rangelands they belong on.

BLM is obligated under WHBA to protect wild free roaming horses as quote an integral part of the natural system of public lands.

But BLM falsely claims that wild horses need to be removed from public lands to protect rangeland health.

The reality is the vast majority of public lands are given over to cattle and sheep grazing which causes far more damage to the land and actually animal farming is a leading cause of environmental destruction.

Right here in Wyoming cattle and sheep far outnumber wild horses which is the case

everywhere horses exist.

There are 356222 cattle, 45,206 sheep and only 1,912 wild horses just within the checkerboard HMA targeted for roundup.

There are not too many wild horses.

I think we can see by these numbers that it's ludicrous to even claim that.

It's time for the BLM to stop being bullied by ranchers.

Own up to its own data and demand voluntary reductions in livestock on public land.

As well as give back to horses.

Some of the 41% of their rightful habitat that has been stolen from them.

And this is not just a problem facing the west, everyone's tax dollars contribute to the animal abuse caused by roundups and the BLM's criminal mismanagement of wild horses.

>> Thank you.

Thank you.

Pat Sheehan.

>> Welcome to the state of Wyoming.

It's a wonderful state.

I'm Pat Sheehan from the Snake River area.

I'm in the southern part of the Dobe area.

I run cattle out there and there's three water holes that has water in it in the spring and summer.

And I probably have 200, 250 horses in that 5-mile, 10-mile area of that area.

As the professor stated here in his documentation, any time they come out from one area and there's no more water around, where I run my cows, I put water tanks to BLM's allowed me to put water tanks out and I haul it with my water trucks.

And I'm one of the best fans of the wild horse there is.

They like fresh water.

And there is no part of me that wants to get rid of wild horses.

I want to keep them to the numbers they're supposed to be and then we'll work together.

Now let me tell you a little bit.

The elk foundation and ducks unlimited has put \$360,000 into our area for water development.

And that's what I challenge some of you horse people.

Let's put some of that money like they do into give water.

Okay.

Give water to, you know, to help promote this.

If we spread the horses out there's room for cattle.

Horses and everything.

I can prove it by putting my water tanks out there.

You know? The horses come in, they go to different areas.

They don't stay in that area where it's beat down.

They go to where there's fresh feed.

Thank you.

>> Thank you very much.

Good afternoon, my name is Kathie Meyer welcome to the northern conservation district.

I'm manager of that entity.

We're charged with protecting natural resources in our area.

I come today to speak for the ranchers in our area because we are trying to manage the rangeland as Dr. Peterson mentioned this morning.

But it's a little hard to do when there is no management of the wild horses.

And we would like to encourage you to manage the wild horses, reduce the number to their lower limits and try to help everybody work together because it is something that can be solved locally.

We feel we have lots of people would here who would be able to work with you.

But when you have national people who are trying to make decisions and delaying decisions, it's not helping the horse situation because the horses are still out there reproducing.

And there are too many horses.

When I was a young girl, I grew up in this area.

It was amazing to see wild horses.

And now we have over 150 head in our allotment.

They do cause resource damage especially when they run in large herds like they do which I think is a result of gathering them.

They learn to run in large numbers and when they do that, they beat down trails, they stomp out streams for water and springs for water.

So there is damage out there despite what some people are saying today.

So we encourage you to manage the wild horses and to do it now.

Thank you.

>> Thank you very much.

>> And so we now have seven more.

If you can get in just under two minutes like Kathie just did, that would be actually very helpful.

But you have two minutes.

Jack Corbett.

Tom rider.

>> Good afternoon.

Dr. Spratling and board members we're very happy to have you here to hear what we have to say today and I appreciate that.

We operate a cattle ranch in allotments where you took a tour yesterday, I guess behind a mountain and big pasture located about 40 miles southeast of Riverton.

What I have to say may or may not constitute the worst case scenario.

But the BLM people in lander have let it be known that it's doubtful that any more roundups will be carried out with the purpose of maintaining horses at AML levels.

This is very troubling to me.

If horse numbers are allowed to climb, and as I'm sure they will without control, the populations will increase much faster than the 20% the BLM now claims.

Here's why: When the mares are treated with anti-fertility drug and two or three years go by, these mares will cycle if they've been synchronized this will cause the numbers to escalate to more than 30, 40% on a yearly basis.

The economy of range allotments the change dramatically when ranchers are no longer viable and just one of these common allotments where you were yesterday where we have presently



permits to graze, the amount of money injected into the local economy would be more than \$1,750,000 on a yearly basis.

When livestock is forced off public much of the water -- (tone) thank you.

I had more to say but I guess I'll give up

>> I'm sure you do.

And we'd love to listen to you.

But we may have to do that during the break.

>> Tad Dockery, Thad.

>> Thank you for coming and good afternoon.

My name is Thad Dockery.

I do run cattle in the allotment that you guys toured the other day.

I guess what I'd like to do is speak on the negative impacts of the socioeconomic impact of adoption of federally owned horses on the private horse market.

From what I understand you guys already talked about it that that was left out of your three proposed economic studies.

I believe we strongly need to look at the population control to help the land's natural resource and also the number of horses being in direct competition with the private industry.

There, I make up for someone who is long winded.

Thank you very much.

>> Let's give a hand to Thad for his brevity.

Thank you, sir.

Tom rich, I mean Ryder.

>> Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon, my name is Tom Ryder and I'm past president and TWS fellow and I'm also a certified wildlife biologist.

I'm here today representing the wildlife society, which is founded in 1937 by some of the preeminent wildlife scientists at the I'm including Alda Leopold, ding darling and others.

It's a nonprofit scientific and educational organization representing nearly 10,000 wildlife professional managers and researchers around the United States and in Canada.

We're dedicated to excellence in wildlife stewardship through science and education and we're a founding member of the national horse and burro management coalition.

As part of this coalition, we remain focused on practical, common sense, scientific-based solutions to horse and burro management and issues.

We strongly support BLM's horse and burro program in its mission for managing healthy herds on healthy ranges.

However, at the previous meeting in April, if you're bored, we expressed concern that BLM's horse and burro program is not fulfilling its goals, in the intervening four months we've not lessened our concerns, based on population estimates we've gotten from BLM.

Horse and burro populations increased from 40,000 last year to 49,000 in March of this year across the entire range.

The current estimate is well above BLM's estimate goals of around 27,000 individuals range wide.

While overpopulated horse and burro herds impact all species of wildlife we're particularly concerned with the greater sage grouse which is currently a candidate for listing under the endangers species act.

Nearly 10 million acres of horse herd management areas overlap greater sage grouse habitat. Ecosystem impacts of overpopulated horses and burros place the species at greater risk of population decline.

If it's listed, it could lead to unprecedented impacts on local wildlife impacts across the U.S. therefore, we ask you to recognize the ecological risks associated with current overpopulations and to manage with all appropriate candor and speed as you can.

Thank you.

>> Thank you very much.

>> And so four to go.

I'm going to give you all four names so you know who you are and what order you're in.

Rhonda slack.

Forgive me if I'm not reading these correctly.

Dawn, rock springs grazing.

Gary Maper and Ray Owens, something like that.

>> I'm Rhonda slack, born and raised here in Wyoming.

I grew up in a town here and my dad retired and moved to Powell and I had the privilege of enjoying the prior mountain wild horses.

I'm happy to hear today that we don't want horses gone.

We just want them managed.

We just want to be able to enjoy them, have our children enjoy them.

But I also would like to be able to go to my local restaurant and enjoy my rib eye steak at a reasonable price because of cattle that were allowed to graze on public land.

I think that we can all benefit from public land I think we're in a unique situation because most of our land is public and we have be able to utilize both public and private lands where back east most land is private and I think we should all be allowed to utilize it.

I think that we need to remember that ranchers are stewards of the land.

That they want their land to be at its best too and they want water to be there and they're going to improve water and they're going to improve grazing because that is their livelihood. And if they hurt it, it hurts them directly.

And if cows are taken off or if cows have to be sold off, it takes a long time to build a herd.

That they have poured their hearts and souls into.

It is the same with wild horses, we don't want to limit them so they're hereditary and their DNA is hurt by limiting them

There has to be ways to manage that.

There has to be ways to manage them quicker than in two years.

That to me is a very scary thing because as we go on with it in our studies and stuff, we are allowing those populations to grow.

Without being managed and that hurts everybody.

And I hope that you guys will take into consideration all the thing that are said today and I welcome you to Wyoming and I'm glad you've came.

Thank you.

>> My name is Don. I represent Rock Springs Grazing Association.

In my other life I spent 37 years with BLM and more than half of that in the wild horse program.

This is the first to have legal roundup with aircraft and participate in two roundups in the early '70s on horseback that failed.

Early on I was given a job to comply with an earlier court order to remove over 8,000 horses from the checkerboard that grew from 1700.

Those 1700 are released horses from ranches mentioned by the doctor.

There was little help between 1971 and 1978 to get that under control.

The BLM somewhat ignored not local, national ignored it.

It would not be a problem. Well, it grew to 9,000.

Rock springs grazing got with the interest groups at that time who were honorable people.

You could work with them and we'd understand and we agreed to have 500 on the checkerboard.

It has never been 500.

For 34 years.

We've tolerated the wild horses on the checkerboard because they all come there in the winter, it's winter range.

Unlike all the experts who are speaking rock springs grazing today you haven't heard one word of truth.

The checkerboard is one of the most complex of land management patterns.

This is recognized in the act in the first roundup areas in Wyoming and across the country were in the checkerboard.

Rock Springs Grazing elected to work with the interest groups and to allow wild horses, only federal cooperative agreement there was.

That has been mismanaged and got to the point in 19 -- or 2013 we've had to go back to court and ask that the they all be removed because it's obvious that BLM is not going to be allowed to manage them.

The BLM is doing its best and we appreciate their effort.

The advisory board is a critical step and your advice to the agency hopefully, it is not media and publicity stunt by many organizations.

Thank you very much.

>> Thank you very much. This is Gary coming to the table.

>> Hello, I'm Gary Moyer. And I'm from the Northwest corner of Colorado, the white river conservation district and I also have the pleasure of serving as the president of the Colorado association of conservation districts as well as the chairman of the southwest region for the national association.

We are a proud member of the rangeland coalition that you heard mentioned earlier.

The main thing I want to talk to you about and I've had the opportunity to address you folks it seems like a number of times now over the last several years.

And it seems like as you've heard here before, nothing changes.

And it's very frustrating from our end of things.

The advisory board over the years has made somewhat I believe is outstanding recommendations to BLM.

And Greg and Joan, I appreciate your efforts.

But you've got to carry this message to your superiors that what recommendation there's board is making and get some of this stuff implemented.

You've heard this over and over.

Trust me, I sympathize with the NEPA process and all that why your hands are tied so hard. But the big issue here is a third of the herd management areas overlap with critical sage grouse habitat.

If this sage grouse gets listed as an endangered species, it's going to be catastrophic to our lifestyle in the west.

BLM is responsible for managing these horses.

If this bird gets listed, BLM by not managing to appropriate management levels within these herd management areas in critical safeguards habitat are very guilty of causing this bird to get listed.

That's how we see it.

So you need to be aware of that.

So please, step up to the plate and help us prevent this bird from being listed.

Thank you.

>> Thank you very much.

And the last word of the day is going to come from Ray Owens, not the last word of the day but the last public comment

>> Yes, I hope it comes over all right.

I'm a board member from the Colorado first conservation district which is in the northwest corner of Colorado.

The sand wash basin herd falls in our area.

I'm here speaking on behalf of several of the landowners of our county.

The sand wash basin herd objective is 162.

They're currently 560 horses.

The two main ranchers that run in that area have taken nonuse so you take agriculture out of that picture of what's going on in that basin and is still the habitat is degrading.

You know, I've been involved, this is my first shot at the horses.

I've been pretty involved in the sage grouse deal.

What I've learned with all this stuff is you can't single species management.

Everybody has to cooperate and work together to get along, come to the table, sit down and talk.

I had the Secretary of Interior last winter talking about sage grouse, through invitation they will come listen.

But we have to all work together to do what is right.

Everything has to stay.

We can't kick one out in favor of another.

Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

>> Okay. Again, we're very appreciative of all of the comments we heard today.

And Boyd, we just worked through our break.

Would you like to take 20 minutes anyway.

>> We're going to take 10 minutes.

>> 10?

10-minute break.

[Brief break in captions]

We have two minutes.

Everybody take your seats.

Okay, we're down to one minute.

Okay. Folks, I think we're back live.

And online.

Okay. Okay. Everybody, if you're still standing, that's fine.

But you need not be talking so that we can get started.

Thank you.

Thank you, sir.

You're going to go sit down now.

Thank you.

Welcome back, everybody, to the Wild Horse And Burros National Advisory Board meeting.

This is our final session and again we appreciate your participation.

Boyd.

>> One note, Dr. Peterson has stayed this afternoon.

So, if a board member has -- wants to refer back to his presentation, has any specific questions, he agreed to answer a question or two for us.

So with that, also, Joan has mentioned she had one or two things she didn't quite get to in her update and we'll give her a moment now

>> Joan: Thank you, Boyd. Just a couple things administratively so to speak.

The next meeting will be April of 2015.

So I just wanted to make sure everyone remembered that.

We've tried to say April and August were going to be the meeting dates so that people can get -- we can get them on the calendars earlier and everybody has good notice so I just wanted to remind people of that.

Three of the positions are going to be coming up for new folks.

Potentially or if the current folks reapply, they would be under consideration as well.

Those three positions are actually June sewing who is the advocacy position.

Boyd Spratling who is our chair and also holds the veterinary medicine motion and Callie Hendricks who is public interest with specialized knowledge position.

The Federal Register notice for all three of those should be coming out in the next couple weeks and we invite anyone interested in those three vacancies to put in an application

The other kind of administrative thing I wanted to mention, Boyd, is just the concept of having a vice chair for the board is something that we have been talking about internally in BLM just kind of we've had cochairs and we realize that co-chair sounds like the same job so we thought vice chair made more sense and basically the definition we think makes sense and what we're really doing is the chair really runs the meetings, helps set the agenda topics, sometimes helps us find speakers, and kind of keeps in communication with the board and the working groups, et cetera.

And if we have a vice chair position which we think we should, basically, the chair and vice chair kind of work out what duties they want to share and how they want to do that.

So I just wanted to mention that.

And I'd ask that if anyone on the board is interested in being the vice chair for the next go

around so to speak, the next meeting at least and in between now and then, if by the end -- within the next two weeks, if you could let me know that, then Greg and Ed rober sob and I will talk about and when we report back to you on your recommendations which is within a month, we'll put in there that as well.

So those were kind of three admin pieces.

I just wanted to mention.

Two other things that I did forget to mention earlier, you've heard me talk before about an animal welfare policy that we are working on for corrals.

You've heard me mention this for the last year, I expect that we will have the draft of that in hand in Washington oh, hopefully maybe September/October and then it does take a little while to get through the approval process.

We've been working on this ever since we wanted to follow up on the animal welfare policy we did for gatherers, so this was our next most important one.

I wanted to remind you it's coming and we've got a really great group of folks in the field working on it.

A team of people who work with corrals a lot and know a lot about that.

So it would set the standards and standard operating procedures for those places

And then finally, I neglected to mention to you our humanitarian assistance pilot which we've been working on for about, I don't know, maybe 9 months or so.

It is a project that would involve sending 100 -- I think you've heard me say this before but let me give you the latest.

It would be up to 100 trained burros that would be sent to Guatemala in this case as part of a humanitarian and assistance to the communities there to use them for pack animals to carry medicines, firewood, those kinds of things.

Our local partner down there is Heifer International. And we've also been working with a couple government agencies DOD and USAID to work out -- we've done a lot of work on this.

A lot of every T crossed and every I dotted to ensure that we have the right partner in place. These animals will be well cared for.

We even went as far as finding a local partner who would provide kind of leather saddle bags that would go with every burro so the goods that were going to be carried would be put on.

I want to update you it's still in process.

We have to work out some administrative pieces internally with the government and other agencies.

But we'll let you know how it tips to go.

But it's still out there.

We do have right now by the way, 983 burros in holding so we think is viable to find good homes for 100 of these trained burros.

And they would be sale eligible animals because they would be of the age and trained up capacity so that we would be sure that they would have good homes and also we would not have a compliance issue.

Actually, Heifer International would be our compliance partner in this.

They would have veterinarians, et cetera to take care of the animals down there and make sure it was working.

It's a pilot.

We wanted to try it.

We still do and we'll see if we can get it launched and see if it leads anywhere from there

>> Tim: I've got one concern about sending the burros to Guatemala or anywhere out of the country it's just that ones they're gone, they're just gone.

And is there going to be any kind of follow-up, something to make sure these guys -- I wouldn't want to repeat this if it ends up badly for the burros, that would be my major concern.

I notice you guys have put a lot of work into it and are looking to do something.

But I've spent a lot of time in that area of the world and animals down there are beasts of burden and they're used but people do tend to take care of their animals because they depend on them so much.

I know there's been a lot of concern in the public that sending them down there is not a really good thing.

I don't necessarily agree with that 100% because my introduction to Spanish horses was riding horses down in that area.

I think there's a lot less animal abuse down there than in the United States in the name of competition because of horses -- in the name of horses because people treasure them.

They're a treasured possession but I would want to make sure there's follow-up to make sure -- I would want monitoring.

I would like to see -- not want.

I can't demand anything.

But I'd feel better if there was monitoring of a year, two year, 5 year, whatever, that you kind of have an idea of how these animals have ended up and where they've gone

>> We definitely thought of that, Tim.

And Heifer International would be the local on the ground partner that would receive the animals and pick out the families that they've screened and they agreed they would monitor their health, they would stay in touch with the families, they would provide some kind of veterinary assistance, so yes, we would want nothing to go wrong with this pilot.

We would really want it to succeed so we've been very, very careful about thinking about everything to make sure that the animals would have a good home, provide a good service to people down there and also they would no longer in some cases at least be in a corral.

They'd be in a working and home environment

>> TIM HARVEY: They get used.

The animals down there get used.

I know to me that's okay as long as you're not -- it's not an abusive thing.

Add really for the most part, they really treasure those animals because they mean so much to them.

It's their family car and work truck and all that all rolled into one.

They do tend to take very, very good care of them in that respect.

They do the best they can.

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: That's all I have, Boyd.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: I really do think this is a humanitarian effort, given the fact there's monitoring, I think it's important the rural society.

I know a group of veterinarians that go from the equine practitioners group and they go down to the Caribbean and work on horses and burros in those areas and the importance of what it

is to their society.

>> TIM HARVEY: I lived down there for six years.

I know there's a lot of concern by several groups.

And I think that if there's a good follow-up with it so that if the -- and I think my biggest concern is to make sure that the partner's doing what they say they're going to do.

And if the partner is doing what they say they're going to do and these animals end up in good hands and everything else, and I think that -- that can be a good thing.

And I think that's what the -- I think that the onus is on the BLM to do that.

Do you agree

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: I agree.

>> We definitely agree and recognize that

>> TIM HARVEY: I'll go down and check on them.

>> Okay. Excellent

>> TIM HARVEY: You come with me.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: Okay.

at this point on the agenda we move toward working group reports.

And I'll speak for the resources working group.

In that it was, it's an effort that we initiated from that group to get Dr. Peterson to come talk about.

With these meetings along with the recommendations we make, I think education and understanding by all members that are involved is an important part of it.

So that's kind of where we went as opposed to making a recommendation specifically to the BLM.

That's where we went this time.

That's kind of part of the deal.

The fact that we ended up in Wyoming is a good deal toward understanding resources.

So that's a report I feel unless Callie wants to add to it from the resources working group.

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: I agree and thank you to Joan and everybody for getting this presentation here.

I felt like it was very valuable and obviously through some of the comments that I think people felt like it was one sided or another.

And our purpose and I don't want to, you know, speak for the presenter on this whole issue.

But as our conversation was at lunchtime and so forth, it doesn't matter what kind of mouth is taking a bite at that grass.

It doesn't matter what species it is.

Doesn't matter if it's a mouse or an elephant.

It's taking a bite of the grass.

So it doesn't matter.

And I am the first to say that there are some livestock people out there who are not managing the land like they should.

But the majority of them are.

And so I'm going to ask that we quit pointing those fingers.

The whole point of this issue and I heard others speaking to it, working together.

As long as we heard comments that we heard, just snide remarks about one side or the other,



we're not going to get there.

And if we can focus on the range and what the mouths that are taking those bites and we heard that yesterday from the wildlife person, showing one piece of grass, she used -- can I use my finger as the grass?

Whatever takes a bite and another bite -- she was focusing on you know, this much for a cow, this much for a horse, this much for an elk.

You have to leave 50% roughly for the grass.

That is actually one thing maybe Dr. Peterson could help us to kind of reemphasize and reiterate.

Why it is we need to leave that 50% of the grass.

Anybody feel like they need that clarification?

Is it just me.

>> I personally think it would be -- Dr. Peterson, would you mind addressing that.

>> Put him on the spot, sorry.

We forget, 50% of that grass needs to be there.

That's what I keep hearing so help me understand why

>> Dr. Peterson: It goes back to -- I appreciate your comment.

It really is about the herbivory.

The animal doing the biting is irrelevant.

It's about how the plants get consumed and how they respond.

On an individual basis plant by plant, they want to respond differently.

So unless you know exactly how animals are going to target a species and they do have preferences, every animal out there has got certain species of plants it's going to go after.

They will do this consistently.

So, if you know that, then you have ability to predict their response.

But, if you're not -- you have to be careful how you put animals on a range because again they're going to find those fir, they're going to work on those first and when they're done with the ones they prefer, they'll go to the next one and work their way through it.

Over time that can drive secessional process.

It can change and cause a shift in the habitat conditions, range itself and quality, its health if you want to use that word.

So the idea is you back off.

You give them flexibility.

So you don't put too much pressure on the rangelands.

The 50% is just -- that's a management guideline that the science behind it is not nailed down but it gives you that flexibility that certain plants are getting hit more often than not.

It's not just going to cause a demise to that portion of the population, it goes back to the idea of secession.

If you see a shift in your plant community toward less desirable species, over time that could be very difficult to get re-established into something you would prefer including the natives that are there.

Blue bunch weed grass is preferred and they'll go after it consistently over and over again.

Herbivores in general.

There's certain ones like that.

Squirrel tail.

There are a couple sunder wheat grass for example, these are targeted plants.

A few of those, flint pertense, these are some are native, some are not.

There are some very palatable.

Very desirable and the shrubs as well.

You get animals in winter fat and they're going to chew that plant until it's gone.

They call it ice cream fat.

You protect the plants that are providing critical elements as far as diversity of the stand goes.

Potential resource for other species, other wide life species, want to maintain that integrity.

All that with the idea you're sustaining the ecological processes and I mentioned that before

but that's one thing that's been pushed in my mind over the time I was working on my Ph.D.

and since then and that is these things -- am I talking too long again.

I have that bad habit.

Fast unecological processes, hydrology, being able to capture and store water in the soil is a critical part of maintaining ecosystem health.

If you've got water moving down a slope and it's hitting plants, it's hitting the litter on the ground that's causing water to go on the ground through infiltration and penetration through the soil, that will get stored in shallow and deeper ground water sources, that water is available for recharge of springs, for plants to be using.

All these are tied together and there are these feedback mechanisms that drive that.

If you start pulling parts out of it, you can potentially have a breakdown of that feedback system to where you begin to lose that.

And it starts to follow apart.

Then you can have issues of elevated erosion -- Okay. I'm stopping there.

That's enough.

>> I was calming Kathie down.

>> Does that help answer that question a little bit?

Do you want me to sit here or come as you need me.

>> We appreciate your time.

We really do

>> About quarter to 9:00 to 9:00, we might be asking another question.

Any other comments from the people on resource committee?

>> Rick Danvir: You talked about stocking rate.

In a lot of respects what grazing management is the way that I also practiced it is using all of those tools and you know, some of the things you're talking about as far as trying to avoid overuse or grazing things at a time when you hurt them, we end up applying those other tools. I didn't know if you -- you know, if you -- it felt like you didn't have time to talk at all about those.

After listening to comments the rest of the afternoon if there were things you wanted to add relative to those tools as far as cattle and horses and wildlife, the various herbivores that are out there

>> Dr. Peterson: Yeah, I think a lot of tools, strategies have been developed with livestock in general in mind.

Major part of that that with a long history of mismanagement of livestock in the past, there are

endless numbers of examples of how poor grazing management results in some catastrophic things ecologically and throughout the west riparian systems for example are some of the most sensitive and I've been through a lot of landscapes where you can see riparian systems that have been channeled down.

They are degraded downward where banks become unstabilized there's a nick point where soils cut back on the bank and they cause them to channel downward and that's because there have not been plants and I mentioned sedges earlier like Nebraska sedge.

Those are like anchors.

They hold it in place.

The number of -- there's an outrageous number of miles of roots in a cubic yard of soil that has Nebraska sedge in it.

It's just -- it's mind-boggling.

The fact is it just holds that soil in place right around the riparian system.

It's like rebar, it holds that ground in place.

There's the Roscan classification system and that's a discussion on its own how you classify stream channels.

There are many classified in the west as those that have been entrenched or sized and you lead from that.

They are no longer in right with the float plain so you lose your wet metal structure.

All that is tied together with plants, ecosystems, structure, and infiltration rates and then how you manage the plant community on there.

The ability to overgraze a system where that falls apart has happened a lot in the past.

This goes back to thresholds and getting those back to where they were is a lot of work, a lot of time and money.

>> Rick Danvir: One other comment.

I had an opportunity to visit with an old friend, Dr. Colin Holmer.

He's the chief of land characterization for USGS in Boise.

And he indicate to me that they were starting to work in concert with some portion of BLM I'm not sure.

But they've become actually quite good at looking at one of the indicators of range condition which is bare ground and are getting good at using the land set data which the nice thing about it is of course is it's available for 40 years and I guess I would encourage us with research mentoring to keep a dialogue going and to this ability to look at range condition and trend on various pieces of BLM and maybe being able to tease out the effects of various conversations of herbivores and management strategies on how it's affecting the landscape.

Is that caused by horses or cows or is it cumulative or maybe all of the above.

I submit if we're going to have -- work collaboratively because I'm somebody that -- I've really enjoyed seeing those horses out there yesterday.

By the same token, I don't want to see a bunch of starving horses out there either.

We need to we're going to make our decisions best if we have real data whether I particularly like what I see or not, I'd much rather make my decisions based on real data than speculation and emotion.

So I would encourage us to see where they're going and see if some of the things they're doing will help us.

So that's my last resource.

Okay.

>> Thank you.

Now we're going to move on to the financial working group.

Callie, Rick, and Fred.

Do we have comments here?

Okay.

How about the public comment working group.

Jim? We've actually spent a lot of time going through public comment.

Simone, are you out there?

Can you hear me?

Can you hear me Simone.

>> Is this working?

Can you hear me

>> TIM HARVEY: We spent a lot of time.

That was insulting, I read every single letter.

Everybody else looks at them too.

I'm just speaking personally right now because you got my blood boiling when you did that.

You did that last time at the last meeting, too.

And it's really hard to hear what you have to say when the blood in my ears is pounding because I'm so pissed off.

You know? Really.

At the delivery, you lose the message and your message is important and it's hard to hear it when you're rude.

And I can say this kind of stuff because I don't get paid by anybody to be up here.

So anyway, that's the first thing I wanted to lead off with.

>> Can you respond?

>> TIM HARVEY: We're doing -- we don't respond to all of them.

But we do read them and we take them in and it's part of the process that we use up here when we interact with the other board members.

We get -- I get hundreds and hundreds of them.

It's not just -- so you expect me to sit down and respond to every one or one of the other members is really unrealistic but we take everything in.

There was some really good comments that we got.

We also get form letters that it's the same people saying the same thing and they downloaded a letter, Fred, what do you do you with yours when you get it like that

>> This is one we got.

It says one of 4,000.

To me this is just one.

If somebody doesn't have enough time or interest to write their own letter like this, I really don't have enough time to read all 4,000 of the same letters.

Okay?

So you know, if I have a choice to read this letter that was printed by somebody and somebody printed it and you just signed it and sent it to me or somebody who took the time to hand write me a letter, the letter I'm going to read is what?

The one that somebody took the time to write.

And Tim is correct, we or at least I read every letter that we get.

Now those letters that we get that says please stop the roundups, we want to save our wild horses.

That don't really help us anything.

These letters that give us ideas and concepts that we can come back and talk about that with can see if there's something we can work out with BLM, those are the types of public comment we want.

It's clear when we get letters like this to say stop the roundups and things that there's a lot of people out there that don't like the roundups and all that.

That's good.

But it don't give us anything to work with.

So, if you're going to do a public comment and Tim, I echo your comment.

I took kind of offense.

I love the little dog but I took kind of offense.

Because I read these.

And so it's really important that you don't -- that you don't write these letters.

But it's really important that you understand that we can't answer every one of them.

But we do on this committee consider every one of them.

>> TIM HARVEY: We got really good ones.

One of the things -- I'm going to use this as a segue.

I got an awful lot of information in the last couple rounds.

This one and the last meeting and a lot of it had to do with allocations of AUMs to cattle versus horses and stuff.

So I started poking around and kicking bushes to see what kind of rabbits were going to point out. And I listened to the importance of things Dr. Peterson was talking about.

The tour that we had yesterday, the biologist talking about it doesn't matter who takes a bite out of something, it just matters how many bites are taken.

Then I start looking at herd management areas and I started to look and I said let's look at the AUMs and the herd management areas.

I went back and copied every version of the law, the '71 law and read the hang.

It says the principle use of herd management area is for horses, not necessarily exclusively but principle use so I looked up principle in Webster's and it says primary.

What constitutes primary?

If it's got 50% public land and 50% private land or if it's checkerboard areas which is essentially 50/50, you've got to have a different set of rules for it.

It's not a simple process, but when I started looking at ratios, I found some areas like -- I took the whole southwest part of Wyoming, I hear the ranchers coming up saying they want to see the wild horses and they criticize the advocates for suing the BLM yet rock strings grazing association sued the BLM to pull 800 horses and they've got an average of some months 145,000 cows.

I think the monthly average was 60 or 70 I came up with head of livestock so there's incongruences on both sides and I think what we need to look at when you have AUM allocation for that area.

2.6 of the AM,s were dedicated to horses and 97 .4% were to horses yet the horses are being rounded up because of range degradation.

Doesn't seem fair to me.

It's not equitable.

And that came from public comment.

So when you say we're not listening, what I'm talking about I don't know that I would have gone digging like that without the public comment we were just reading and on the other hand, all the ranchers who put all their sweat into keeping water in front of the horses they do all the other range improvements and advocates are saying to the ranchers, all you think about are your cows, a lot of times they're feeding and watering the horses.

So I think one solution is for all the disparate groups instead of sitting around throwing rocks at each other is get together and put your boots on the ground and do something.

It's really easy to write letters and it's really easy to sit up here in the audience and make smart ass comments.

But it's a lot harder to put your boots on the ground.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: Is this in the form of a report to the board, Tim.

>> I told you I only needed 10 or 12 minutes and I've probably got a couple more.

I'm sure June has something to say.

>> It's kind of hard to sit on a committee with Fred and Tim.

>> There you go.

But you bring a really good balance to us

>> June, can you say that again?

Your mic wasn't on.

>> JUNE SEWING: Anyway, and as -- is it still not on?

Hello, are you there?

>> Pull it just -- it's on, pull it a little closer.

>> There you go.

Try that one.

>> Okay. Sorry about that.

Anyway, I reiterate what Tim and Fred had said.

I do read all the possibilities all the possibilities and I want you to know public comments we do get the written comments that you made so, if you didn't get a chance to make your point or to finish it, we will have the opportunity to read it.

The other point I'd like to make is many of the comments made were like we need to do something.

When it comes to the portion of the meeting where the board presents recommendations and talked about the things, there's less than half of you were made comments.

So I think -- you know, so it's really kind of hard for us to to take everything that is said into consideration because there's in my mind some doubt as to where the actual feelings or

whatever come from.

>> TIM HARVEY: I'm calmed down a little bit now.

It comes down -- I don't want to take too much time on it.

There's a lot of really good stuff.

Ginger, your comment to me that I should make sessions, Esther, how many times did I call and harangue you last year about the fact that you guys made that offer and didn't take it.

I do get involved and I don't like being used as an opportunity for you to grandstand if that's what you were doing because that's what it felt like you were doing.

I'm saying I'm trying to do a job.

I'm a volunteer.

I don't get paid to be up here, I don't get paid for the hours and hours and hours that I spent outside of here to do this.

I do this because I love the horses.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: Whoa.

Tim.

This is a discussion on public comment from a report from your working group to the board

>> To the board.

This is your conversation time together.

>> TIM HARVEY: Well sometimes it's been a few years, it's built up.

>> It's just you understand when you talk to them, they want to talk back and we have a different process going

>> TIM HARVEY: I stand corrected and I apologize to my fellow board members out there and to the people out there too.

When it comes down to it, Fred, do you have anything.

>> Fred: Let me sum up to the board what we've done.

The public comments we've gotten, we have read.

We've talked about the points for each of your all's committees and we have relayed them to you.

These were the points that were on target, something that the board could do something about.

There's a lot of other stuff in there that was kind of like a wish list, but the stuff we gave y'all was stuff that we think the board could do

>> And that's an important part of the working group.

Isn't isolated.

It needs to be relaying stuff to this.

The other respective working groups for use, you know.

>> TIM HARVEY: The reason I started looking around at what AUM allocations were is brought up disparities and it is something we should maybe look at that you know, things that, you know, it seems to me that a huge amount of degradation in the range conditions is being caused, is being blamed on horses but when I started looking at how many AUMs were allocated to horses versus livestock the best ratio I could find was 20% to the horses and a lot were 12% or less.

And then I hear, then you see that a lot of the ranchers are saying the horses are out there 365. A lot of places did have livestock but when I thought about the AUMs as pennies on the dollar,

that's kind of what they are.

They're an amount of feed that will feed an animal for a month.

So, if you think of them as pennies on the dollar.

It doesn't matter if I got 20 pennies and I'm the horse and the cow has 80 pennies and the cow spends his 80 pennies in five months and I take 12 months to spend my 20, the difference I see is what Dr. Peterson was talking about is the time that they're feeding actually seems more critical than how much they're eating at times.

There's a sensitive period.

Is there something that the board can look at to take into consideration maybe looking at making a recommendation maybe this is something we think about and discuss.

Is there something to think about maybe looking at changing or doing some -- it may be as simple as what we saw yesterday of riparian -- different -- some more protection in the riparian areas, things like that.

But it's just got my mind spinning on I started looking at the dollars and cents of it and how much money we're spending to feed a horse in holding compared to if it's just left out on the range.

And then I looked at complexity of getting into the grazing act and all that.

The rate set by Congress is not set by BLM, \$1.35 a month.

BLM has absolutely zero control over that.

And then you have like Mr. Falen pointed out the amount of money he's put in to his ranges. It's a complex issue.

Not cut and dry. And I think one of the things we realized from the public comment or at least I did is that a lot of people have a very simplistic view because of their passionate position.

And I think a takeaway from that is that the more we can share and maybe that's where it could work into a recommendation at some point.

Coming up with some kind of vehicle that would allow these disparate groups to get together and experience something at the same time so they'll get an appreciation for what everybody is passionate about

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: You've been bouncing around a very complex issue.

And I can see Greg is nervous with the whole thing right now.

But there's more to -- we get so hung up on numbers but the fact there is no recovery time, no rest period for the plant.

As well as vulnerable time that they may be grazed.

So again, this may be the collaborative effort everybody sitting down and talking is an important part of this and trying to hash that out right here.

>> TIM HARVEY: We're not going to hash it out now.

The reason I want to bring it up Boyd is I want everybody on this board to think about it and see what we can do to help each other understand the different aspects of it amongst ourselves

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: That's where we invited Dr. Peterson here today to talk about the land itself.

>> TIM HARVEY: I would love to attend a couple day seminar with some of the board members.



If that's possible, I would pay for it out of my pocket. It would be fun.

I don't mean this is a compliment from the bottom of my heart, you're the coolest range nerd I ever met!

A grass nerd, I guess.

It's cool

>> Greg, would you like to --

>> Well, you mentioned something that I've been wondering about and Joan, I'm going to look to you because we may already have this mechanism in place and I'm going to use the grazing fee as an example.

Because to my eye there's a lot misunderstanding in the general public about where that comes from.

So thank you for mentioning a little bit. -- for mentioning where it comes from.

But what I'm -- it seems to me -- you know, we have -- I've been to two of these meetings now and this isn't the first factoid that I've observed that there's some misunderstanding about.

And I'm wondering -- there's a certain education element here that seems like we could do something about at least in terms of putting correct information out there I'm looking to Joan because I'm thinking we may already have this but isn't there some way we could use a Web site.

If there are themes of we can put information out there to help educate people about things like the grazing fee.

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: I don't know if this is part of the FAQ sheet on our Web site.

We can check.

Principle use we've gotten the answers out there many times.

So we can always do a better job educating and posting some of these -- more of these kind of misconceptions or misunderstandings

>> GREG SHOOP: So here's a thought.

I don't make recommendations but just a thought I had.

In terms of the interaction between the public comment subcommittee and BLM, if you guys tie in to this page that she's talking about as you're looking at comments coming in, if you observe that there is something that we need to correct or something we need to expand on it seems like that would be a nice connection to make if you were to feed that back in to BLM as you're processing the comments so that we can then get something up on the Web site.

>> FYI.

Dr. Cope, you had a comment

>> I've been listening to this and I've been developing a vision or plan where we can go in the future.

I want us to look forward more than back.

But using kind of the model of over lunch hour I was on the phone to EPA where we're setting up a conference call for a week from Wednesday of our subgroup on water issues and we're going to have during that conference call a presentation from the state of Michigan explaining how it is they run their permit system and see if we can apply that as a model to other states.

I think we can have working groups that can do similar things.

But in doing so, I was reminded earlier this afternoon listening to the comments and I told Doug Thompson that I remember the days that I used to chair the environmental energy and

land use steering committee for NACO and people came in as chairs after me wanted advice. I said the only important piece of advice I can give you is when you walk in there, you check your opinion at the door.

What you think doesn't matter now.

After the meeting and before, you're perfectly free to express your opinion.

But while you're running the meeting, you don't count.

I would recommend to the public don't check your opinion but check your emotion.

When we get into these things, if we want to deal with reality, our own personal foibles and predispositions is sometimes interfere with making good logical rational decisions and analyzing the data presented to us under the proper scope.

If we can do that and take the emotion out of the equation and let's look at raw data, let's look at raw facts and you're right, the AUMs may add up.

Steve may be right also, who eats what when may be a more important piece of data that we simply don't know yet.

If we can keep emotion out of it and look at what's real down the line and if we get public comment that brings things in that aren't just like we don't like it but hey, have you thought of this, if we get into that, we can go out and recruit people that can get on the conference calls with those working groups, possibly get good information and have those groups report back to the full committee.

It looks to me like a way that might work and be more efficient and actually bring in better information on a smaller scale and get it better refined.

At least it's a thought.

John

>> JOHN FALEN: I've been listening to this AUM conversation here for quite a while.

And of course I've been actively involved in AUM situation for a good many years and to start off with for the benefit of Joan and Greg, the preformula was passed by Reagan. Have you seen that document?

It's a document that he set the grazing fee formula and he signed that into law.

And that's the law that we've been going by.

And it's still what we're using.

And I hear this rhetoric all the time.

About the \$1.35 we're using today.

Admittedly that sounds cheap.

I admitted that to Tim the other night.

But when you put all the expenses in there that we do, Tim also mentioned the water development we do.

To maintain the lands there's hours and hours of work that goes into it and hours and hours of expense.

When talk about the AUMs on the ground and I heard people talk about the rest, we rest the resource continually.

It may be summer use or winter use but it will be on a totally different resource so the resource you come off of is rested except in the areas where there's horses running on it.

That's not rested.

That's use all year round.

We've got all kinds of documents that I can get you folks to substantiate when these costs are because our costs in reality.

I heard folks talking about \$10 in AUM and so forth in the private sector.

And our expenses are that or more.

I just spent \$70,000 developing a water lined and a lot of other ranchers have done the same thing.

When we develop a water line and put pipes in the ground and put that water into tanks, we're feeding the antelope.

We're watering the sage grouse.

We're watering everybody that comes by and we're glad to do it.

It's not a problem.

But it's an expense that we have to deal with.

And we are not doing our job entirely because we've done a really poor job of informing the public of what we've done out there that's a benefit to the public lands.

And you know, I think we got room enough for everybody to do what we need to do out there.

Providing we get the horses out there back to AML.

There isn't any ranchers that want all these horses gone.

I've heard people say right here in these groups that the ranchers want all the horses gone.

That's a totally misnomer.

That's not true.

Most all the ranchers enjoy those mustangs and I think Boyd would attest to that.

He's got neighboring ranchers who have lots of mustangs.

If we get AML to where it should be, I think we could work this out without a problem.

But we've got a big hurdle to get over to get there.

There's no doubt about that.

But in closing, I think while we're in this stalemate time of not getting anything done, and there's really good conversation went on the first night we got here between Boyd and Greg and Sue about different ways for populations to be controlled.

And I think they're op to things that could be a really valuable asset to all of us.

And I think everybody out here needs to support that.

Because again, nobody wants to get rid of all these mustangs

We just want to get them in a position where we can control them and everybody live.

And I think we ought to really go ahead with what you guys are talking about the other night.

Because that excited me

Having said that, again, we had a difficult time swallowing the fact that we've got to go another three or five years to get something really on the ground because we don't have that much time.

We've got to move a whole lot quicker than that and we've had that discussion and that's got to be up front.

We've got to figure out a way to get all this on the ground a lot paster.

Thanks, Boyd.

>> FRED WOEHL: Sure.

And finalizing the public comment report from the committee, I'm brand-new on the board.

This is my second meeting.

I wasn't able to stay at the last meeting

from the time of that to noticing the environment of the board and the public, I sensed a change today.

I sensed more of a change of a willingness to work with the board and everybody from a lot of the comments I heard.

And I would like to propose that we kind of pursue that in some manner to maybe get a little bit more active input like Cope said from some of these groups.

The thing about if you're going to do something like that -- and I feel this deep in my heart, is that anybody that's involved with it like Cope said has to check your own opinion at the door. Everything has to be on the table.

It can't be well I'm going to be there but don't do this.

Everything has to be there.

Everything has to be on the table to talk about and try to resolve a solution.

So, if it's in -- in order as one of our board recommendations to BLM, I'd like to propose a motion that we try to -- I don't know how to word this, just exactly right

>> Why don't we work on the wording because the next agenda item is actually making proposals and recommendations.

So why don't you work through what you'd like to propose to the rest of the board

>> Fred: I will do that.

>> Okay. Have we made it through the public comment working group report?

>> There were a couple other things that I picked up that came through the public comment.

And one of the things that came across through a lot of letters was that the -- a lot of the people felt that the whole horse management is actually -- the focus is on the cattle industry, cattle and sheep industry and that the horses are actually being regarded as more of a pest to that or ancillary use to herd management areas and that the emphasis should really be that we should be focused on the management of the horse herds to benefit the horse herds and -- and it doesn't seem to be that way.

That's something that came through loud and clear to me through a lot of people.

A lot of people really feel like this is more of a cattle management or a ranging management operation oh, by the way, let's see what we can do about making sure the horses are not interfering with that too much and that came across loud and clear to me.

So I think it's something that needs to be recognized and I think by recognizing those kind of comments and stuff, we need to respond to it or we need to react to it or the BLM needs to adjust to it or something.

There needs to be some kind of response to that because that's coming through loud and clear in probably three quarters of the letters.

>> BOYD SPRATLING: That's appropriate to consider that fact that that is coming through but you have considerations in the state of Nevada almost half the state is in the form of an HME or another.

So those are impacts if you talk to counties or Chamber of Commerce, they would say hey, you know, let's not stifle our economic capability entirely.

>> TIM HARVEY: We're talking about HMAs we're, not public lands ranching in general. We're talking about on the HMAs.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: That's half the state of Nevada.

>> TIM HARVEY: Well Nevada is a different case.

I acknowledge that.

I'm not proposing they're right or wrong.

What I'm trying to do is report --

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: And that's totally appropriate.

>> TIM HARVEY: And that's totally appropriate.

The board is -- the reason we formed this committee is because people kept saying they were sending stuff to us and nobody was listening.

So I think this is important for us to throw it out on the table and for us to discuss so they know we are listening

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: That's totally appropriate.

>> TIM HARVEY: I think we have an obligation to have a response at some point to those kinds of concerns.

Whether that response is action or an explanation it's got to be one or the other, right?

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: I would say so.

>> TIM HARVEY: Does that sound reasonable?

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: Mm-hmm.

>> JUNE SEWING: In response to the comments people have made and whether there's been response, some suggestions have a lot of value but sometimes there's other things that get involved with whether they can be -- whether they can actually be varied out.

Because of rules, regulations, whatever the BLM is allowed to do.

I think the complex takes a lot of criticism for things they don't do.

But sometimes their hands are tied.

And I'm not saying that they're always right and I feel as much as any of you do that -- I mean, I like to see things done now.

But unfortunately and not through any fault of their own their hands are tied.

But I do want you to know your comments are valuable to us and we do communicate with them what they are.

But they have to evaluate whether they can actually be implemented or not.

So just -- wanted to say that

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: Do we have a report from the volunteer working group, which is also Tim, Cope and June.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: Fred, did you have a comment?

>> Fred: I have one thing. I've had several contacts about this volunteer group and I've been a volunteer for BLM for 10 years.

And one of the things dealing with these volunteers that's really, really hard is that BLM or at least the BLM employees that I've dealt with have a they've been burned in the past so they're hesitant to -- when someone comes up and says I want to volunteer, they're really hesitant to say well come on.

Because you know, one of the things that woman called me about is she went to the local holding area, wanted to take pictures of the horses to post on Facebook.

That sounds really good.

But in the past some of those pictures that have been taken like that have been used to black

ball or black mark BLM so the BLM person said no, you can't.

Well, it made the person mad because she was only trying to help.

So you know, one of the things that I think we really need to do is maybe work with Joan and her staff to come up with an application form or something that would give more confidence to the person that's having this person work with them.

Along the same line advise the BLM volunteers that they have to do it BLM's way.

>> At the field office level what things would have be of benefit to v volunteer help.

I want to come take pictures as a volunteer.

It could be used in a lot of different manners.

But, if it comes from the district level that we have a need for a specific task, that could be related back through the Washington office and hopefully, put on the Web site, you know, we can look at it that way.

But I think we have to establish the need.

Maybe it needs to come at the same time

>> There again, right, the district or the need to -- if they had -- then they need some help and maybe go about that way.

I think this would be good.

There has to be a way.

There are awfully good folks out there that could be doing a lot of things and I hate not to let them do something.

I mean, in the state of Arkansas where I'm at, we're so far away from the eastern office if there wasn't me and a few others, there would be no compliance visits made because it's just too -- you know, it's a long ways.

It's about 400 miles for a specialist to come and inspect.

And so there has to be a way to use these folks.

>> If I'm not mistaken, I believe that was a recommendation we made last time about opportunities for volunteerism on the Web site and the BLM did accept that saying they would do that.

Now, I don't know what the mechanism would be for them to get the information from the districts to the things that need to be done in order to put it on the Web site.

But I -- I believe they are working on doing that.

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: Sarah, right, and/or Joan, you're in the process of developing some things from the local levels job descriptions per se so that this is something we could use, right?

Okay.

So that may not be as fast as some of us would like but sounds like you're making progress on that?

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: Seems like an easy place to start what are things field offices need help with.

But the field office needs the help and they would link the place where the work is needed.

So yes, we're working on that.

But I -- I do think that some of Fred's points about trust, people having been burned by some volunteers who really don't want to do it BLM's way they want to do it their way it has broken a lot of trust and it takes time to rebuild.

So, if there are positions that people could volunteer in that maybe the monitoring and compliance is one of them because it seems a little more risk free in a way.

But it's -- it will take time, I think, and we're talking about a lot of field offices too.

And they need to feel as if the people showing up are showing up with trustworthiness too.

>> It boils down no matter what Joan says if the person in the field don't want the help or don't want to go through the time and effort to get the help, it's not going to be done.

Joan can send something out and say you need to use all the volunteers you can and person in the field office gets it and says gnaw.

It has to be a 2-way street where there has to be work on their part too and I don't know how we go about improving that.

But I think we really -- that's something that we as a board can help, I think

>> JUNE SEWING: There's one other way that groups can help -- am I on?

I know there are some groups out there including the one that I'm associated with who really don't have a lot of people that are in close proximity of what they do.

We have a lot of members, but they're spread out across the country so one of the things we do is support financially.

There's projects that need to be done.

They don't have the resources themselves to do it.

And so, you know, they let us know what needs to be done and we choose what we want to do or how much we can support.

They order the material from the vendor and the vendor bills us for it because we don't really have any financial involvement with the BLM in that respect.

But that's another way some groups -- I know there are some groups out there who don't have a lot of financial ability but there are groups out there who do have quite a significant amount who may not be able to do, you know, the hands-on volunteering as well.

>> What's the hands-on part, Joan?

Are there liabilities?

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: Depends on the work but they do have to sign a volunteer form which covers insurance, et cetera.

If I could just say June's example of June's organization, June, I think comes to the BLM and says what do you need.

And if she can help, she does as opposed to some folks who come and say here's what you need.

That's where you get the resistance of perhaps that isn't what the BLM thinks is needed.

So some challenges.

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: And I think some of you guys are quite involved with your local resource advisory councils.

But I haven't served on it but I attend the Colorado Northwest Resource Advisory Council frequently as well as being involved with the local BLM office mostly on ranch health and grouse issues right now.

But one of the things that always -- that never ceases to amaze me is how little the local offices are aware of what's happening at the national level and vice versa.

I know it's a large organization and I don't know how to fix that.

But maybe one of the things that we as an advisory board could do is reach out to the local

racks and so we're basically a RAC at the national level.

Just on focused on horses.

But that communication back and forth at those local racks, I personally typically, during public comment, I get up and give public comment at a local RAC meeting about what's going on at the national level.

And it's interesting to see the reaction because they don't know.

Not just the RAC members but the BLM folks.

They don't know.

They're not tuned in and watching.

Once in a while they need to tune in and see how it all comes down to them and vice versa.

How can we do that?

I don't know if it's through the RAC process or what.

It's a thought.

>> Eastern states don't have a RAC.

>> I understand that, I'm talking about those out on the range and the west where we're dealing with that.

Resource advisory councils.

>> Fred: But you say to keep up, the eastern states are so big, it covers such a vast area that we don't have local input.

And I think that's a shame, but again, the BLM presence is more in the west than it is in the -- back east

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: I will tell you in the RAC groups, they're dealing with everything, it's BLM wide.

So we have to understand and recognize horses are only a piece of everything that BLM has to deal with.

I totally get that and I respect that.

>> Callie, to the degree that the problem is in the area of needs improvement for BLM internally, communicating from the national office down through the state offices and lower in the organization, just as an FYI we had a training session in Reno two months ago.

>> June.

Sometime in June

>> Yeah, couple months ago and that particular issue was raised by the BLM folks internally as an area that could be improved on and we didn't disagree.

So it's actually something that's on John's radar screen to improve that communication flow back down through the organization.

>> I think that's a good idea.

>> If I were you, I would expect to see some improvement in that regard.

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: Okay. I will expect to see that.

>> And you should be sure to let Joan know if you don't see improvement in that regard?

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: And you know, I'll be sure to let the Colorado state office know, too.

Since you'll be there.

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: If I could just -- since I know Callie is going to be watching now, we have a once a month phone call in the state for the wild horse and burro program and the theory is



they tell their wild horse and burro folks.

Some of them heard me give the update and they said we haven't heard that.

Nobody wants another conference call but we have talked about maybe once a month I have an open conference call with some of the other field offices and say anybody who wants to come in, come on.

It's hard to keep Washington connected with the field.

And communication is one of the key ways, because we're not traveling all over the place as much.

So we are -- we are aware of it.

But it's going to be through conference calls I think and webinars, that kind of thing

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: So do you think there is anyway that the RACs and us -- does that make any sense?

Maybe it doesn't.

But I'm just thinking how can -- I know our local RAC is talking about -- and they have and several others have sent letters to the advisory board on what they think or want but there's no, again, communication going on.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: What if we did something as simple as making sure the RACs get copies of the minutes after they're approved?

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: I think it could be huge.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: Something as simple as that so see what's going on.

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: That's definitely doable through the state leads.

But my personal opinion Callie's idea of you folks talking to the RACs that you may know or work with already, that's actually a great idea and you could use some of the materials that we show you, the update of the program, bar graphs, you know, that kind of stuff and use them with whatever audiences you think would benefit.

I think that's a great idea.

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: I was just -- you know what I would do.

I will volunteer that if there's anyway that I can get -- I don't know how -- what the deal with is the RACs, if there's a point person for the RAC.

I don't know if that's the public relations person?

Kind of that?

If I could get an email for each one of them -- and I don't know how many of them there is, but, if there's an email that I can make a group and go click one, I will send those -- you bet.

>> I would make that commitment to help bridge that gap.

>> Let me just say Joan would be happy to have Sarah pull together the list of the PAOs in the different state offices.

And get you that list of their names and email addresses.

That would be an easy thing to pull together.

Huh, Sarah?

>> Thank you, Sarah.

>> Eastern Idaho two weeks from tomorrow?

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: Okay.

with that, can we move -- I'll give the report on the population growth suppression working group.

And basically --

>> say that again?

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: Population growth suppression working group.

Can we put an acronym up for that or --

>> yeah.

>> Public comment, I kept track down through here and there's plus or minus 45 comments.

And 20 of them was rancher friendly.

And probably higher percentage than most people would think.

But I -- I kept track today.

For just interest sake for everybody involved

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: We did have a good discussion on more of a clinical basis bouncing around the three of us.

And with other people listening as to what our thoughts were on population growth suppression and surgical things IUDs, a number of things coming out.

But there's nothing for us as a group to report essentially because all that is still sitting, you know, those proposals coming in or that did come in for universities and else where are still being evaluated by the Academy of Sciences.

So that group will probably not do a lot of recommending until those reports come through and filter down to Joan and then hopefully to us.

>> As soon as possible can we deliver that?

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: Okay. So that's the population growth suppression report unless you have a question.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING:

>> TIM HARVEY: At the last meeting I said I wanted to stay involved with that group.

And if initially when since we decided that Sue was going to step in there and I was going to step back.

But I said you know what as a main advocate, I think it's important for me to still have a presence with that group.

And that was the last thing that was said about it.

And my understanding is --

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: If that's what your wish is.

>> TIM HARVEY: I think we can use that as recommendation, right?

I'd like to recommend Fred take my spot on the volunteer spot

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: We should do that under recommendations, probably.

>> You should write that up

>> TIM HARVEY: I'm going to write it up.

>> Get working on the wording.

Now we're moving on to ecotourism.

Which Tim, you're involved with so as a humane advocate, let's hear what you've got to say.

-- Tim Harvey that's Callie's gig.

She's the chair.

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: We intended to have a meeting. And we never did get to have a meeting.

Various other things kept having conversations that interested everybody a little bit more.

I'm going to tell you a personal -- well, I guess -- oh, yeah, I checked that at the door.  
Yeah.

Okay.

I checked the emotion, there's no question.

So on the ecotourism and we talked about the difference between ecotourism and ecosanctuaries at least I did kind of via email.

I'm thinking ecotourism, the conversation that we originally started was that BLM or that we focus on getting people to get tours and that kind of thing of local HMAs that are maybe close to populations and so I'll use grand junks as an example just because I'm familiar with that one and we got the little book cliffs heard and there's a group that's extremely involved there.

They do an excellent job.

They've had an MOU with BLM for 30 years.

There is a hotel that's not far from -- that's very close and they're really getting into the tourism stuff and they're in the vineyards.

That's their main draw.

But they're interested in getting tours up in to the little book cliffs.

So my understanding with the ecotourism was that we would try to find some of those key kind of areas, identify them and work with local offices to encourage that to happen.

So it would end up being a special permit type use on BLM lands for people to take tours and they may or may not charge for them and do that.

That was my impression when I got involved on this.

And we did have I a couple meetings several years ago and that was our recommendation and it hasn't went anywhere.

I don't know if that's something we were supposed to do or if BLM was -- they didn't remember.

I know there was a recommendation made and I didn't go back and look.

That's my own fault.

I didn't go back and look how could we move forward with that

>> Good question and good topic to discuss.

I'm looking at the thing in your book that describes what that group was -- and you probably are too, everybody.

It's under tab 8, describes what that group was going to do.

And really only a piece of it is not exactly as you -- as the perception may have been according to what we wrote down anyway.

That's why writing down the recommendations takes a while because it's important we all understand what you're telling us or asking us or recommending that we do.

Educational component and opportunities for supporting local community benefits.

And this is eco --

>> I think that was it, number 4.

>> And it refers to an ecosanctuary which is of course different from an HMA.

So I think it warrants a little more conversation and maybe what would be useful is that if that working group as you've got it now has a phone conversation, one of us can join in and we can kind of talk about what we can do with this idea that -- what is really what the group wants to do and how they could help this concept because I think it's a little muddy in terms of the

old -- the original recommendation as it got written down anyway.

>> We decided to kind of try to blend them together, correct.

>> I think the intent was to separate them out more because they're more ecotourism opportunities than just that ecosanctuaries.

>> Right.

So what we're talking about the ecotourism is really meant to be like what we went on yesterday would have been a classic eco tour.

To help an entity whether it's a private entity or whatever, something, to be able to do that and brings awareness because one of the components, one of the key components in this is education.

People on an eco tour yesterday would have realized they would have a lot of confusions that are out there maybe straightened out a little bit yesterday on who's doing what and when and where and to whom.

I think it's a valuable component and I know it's one that's a touchstone for you, Callie is the educative aspect of ecotourism.

We also discussed trying to tie something with my group of doing the -- we can just kind of run this together because I don't have anything significant to report on the repopulation issue at this point.

The taking maybe if we could find a place or if the BLM can identify an area that could be repopulated with a nonreproducing herd that you could set that up as the ecotourism aspect of it.

That's what we talked about at the last meeting is doing something like that.

>> TIM HARVEY: I have to say I haven't done a lot to chase that down because other things were tugging at me, maybe we should make a concerted effort to do something about this.

>> Tim, you make a good point there.

That's one of the questions I've got is this really where we need to spend time and energy or is there other places right now we need to spend time and energy and maybe dissolve this committee for a little while.

I don't know if it needs to dissolve or go on hold or -- the I personally think I'd rather spend my time on resources and financial part

>> TIM HARVEY: The committee can stay there.

Just because it's taking a nap doesn't mean it's dead.

Hold a mirror to its nose

>> One of the aspects of this that I think is so important is the education piece.

And as far as the board staying active and promoting education, I think we need to.

I think that's just as important as all the other things that we are trying to do.

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: I would agree with you 100% on that.

I guess I would just again often times we're making recommendations, BLM, you need to do this.

So I just want to caution us to not get BLM sidelined off on to another project when in my opinion I want them focused in before we ever gather horses which actually this is before they gather horses

>> Fred: And I'm coming at this from a perspective from the eastern states and just like what my colleague June said the other day folks back east thinks the west is a fenced off thousand

acre pasture with grass knee deep so getting out there and seeing that and educating and showing them that is going to make a big difference because it is.

It's different in the east than it is out west.

Outside of everything else.

It's just different.

And educating that would cut down on a lot of these negative commence.

It would cut down on a lot of problems we have, I think.

But I don't know if ecotourism is way to go because special use permit that the government has, I dealt with the park service before.

You've got to do Nepa.

You've got to do everything.

It is for an entrepreneur, it's like stepping in a bunch of man you're.

So it's not something manure.

So it's -- you didn't know I was a poet, did you?

I think we need to keep it active to promote education

>> TIM HARVEY: You stimulated part of my brain that comes up with silly ideas sometimes that turn in to other things.

we're talking about the ecotourism and talking about the educative aspect of it.

Is there -- and maybe something like this exists and if it is, I'm not aware of it.

How about a virtual eco tour this goes around all the issues you spoke to if the BLM could develop something that somebody could go on on the Web site and take and get the same information, go to the basically you would just be able to go from bullet point to bullet point and be able to talk a virtual eco tour on the Web site that would maybe have an opportunity to educate folks with some of these issues.

It would be way less money to do.

You wouldn't have NEPA issues

>> They already have a DVD out like that.

>> Do they have something on the Web site that you could click on and say take a virtual tour of an eco tour of an HMA.

>> Tim, that's kind of a cool idea.

>> Hallelujah.

>> TIM HARVEY: Callie just sprinkled holy water in my general direction.

>> I'm going to pass the offering plate

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: Thought I'd throw that out there.

>> TIM HARVEY: You could do the book cliffs with or an area with ginger up in the Pryors engage some of the groups out there in volunteerism and it would be a great vehicle to get used, get some volunteerism, interaction and I think it would be a great opportunity.

Don't you think Mr. Shoop.

>> Yes.

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: Okay. That's what our committee will work on.

>> Comprehensive Animal Welfare Program was basically updated with the BLM's updates. Increasing adoptions and sales from a BLM formed working group.

Fred, did you have comments on this?

>> Fred Woehl: Yes, I do.

I apologize for not getting everybody a copy of this, but I had a lot of input from some groups and friends and got some pretty good ideas here.

What I'd like to do is have copies made of this and given to every board member and BLM.

But some of the things that they are talking about makes an awful lot of sense.

And I'll just highlight two of these because these are two things that could be simple.

Number one, make all short-term facilities adoption centers where people can call and make an appointment to come look at a horse.

If they want a horse.

I mean, we have short-term centers all over the place.

Care centers and have them be a satellite adoption satellite.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: I think that's kind of the case already unless they're privately run.

>> Fred: Now, the short-term care, they're all privately run.

>> Palomino Valley.

>> And Palomino Valley and rock strings but there are some short care out there that are --

>> Zach is going to clear that up for us, I see.

They're privately owned so they have a BLM presence.

They're staffed by BLM personnel and the majority of them do have an adoption component.

Or they have the ability to take pictures and post those animals on Internet adoptions so that they can be bid on and adopted via the Internet adoption.

So they have an Internet component or an adoption component to them

>> Fred: They have it and that's one of the things we're talking about is pictures.

Were you in here when I talked about the volunteer who wanted to take pictures and they wouldn't let him.

>> Yes.

>> Fred: That's one of the things they did.

And honestly, if I'm out there taking pictures of a horse, I want to take a picture of its head.

If you'll look on the Web site some of the pictures on there about the horses don't do them justice.

And so better pictures would help or even a short video that's what some of this is.

But Zach I'm going to get you a copy.

They did not know and apparently they did not either that all short-term areas or facilities have an adoption component.

>> And the pictures taken in ones like Falen those are taken by BLM staff.

The BLM staff members actually go out and look at the horses and make some sort of, you know, determination on the suitability of an animal to be adopted.

Take the picture and then place it up on the Internet.

>> Fred: Right.

And the other thing this is something quick.

just two short things I don't want to take up a lot of time since I'm going to hand this out.

But identify the foals born in facilities by the mare's HMA, that would give pride of ownership.

If you adopt a yearling it says Oklahoma because that's where it was born.

A mare that was brought in and born.

If you put on the paper that this an antelope valley foal because that's where the mare was from, it would be worth it.

>> We have some capability now.

Some animals are born in a facility itself so it can be difficult at times to determine that information.

When the animal is actually taken off and then given its freeze brand and given an individual number, unless it's -- when they wean them off, it's not that easy to pair them and know which mare they were paired with.

So it's something we could potentially look into.

At this time,

>> In those cases we might have to identify the facility they were born in, right.

>> That's what we do now.

But it comes back as you know, mare from PVR, foal from PVC, not necessarily I think what Fred is talking about is that the original source of the mare.

We could look into that

>> I think it would help because you get around these people that adopt a lot of horses and you know, I have several.

And where is your horse from?

To them that's a sense of pride.

And when I tell them I've got an adobe town horse, wow, there are beautiful horses out there.

You know?

>> TIM HARVEY: My interest personally is anything with Spanish markers and I've had 12 sulfur horses from the sulfur herd and that's what I want.

One of them was born in captivity and I know he was a sulfur because I've been around enough to know who his mom was and where he came from.

So -- but to have that information as Fred said, it would be extremely valuable I think for potential adopters.

Especially people who are looking for herd characteristics.

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: Just a suggestion Boyd and the board about this.

If this is the increasing adoptions and sales working group, it's a BLM formed working group and Debbie Collins has been assigned to kind of be your lead for it.

I would suggest that as opposed to discussing the recommendation you're making to us now and can we do it, get into the weeds if the board wants to make this recommendation to give this to us, we will look at it internally and see what pieces we can adopt.

I mentioned this morning that the Nevada adoption team is looking at those other two reports and I would give this to them and say would you incorporate this into your thinking as well.

That's the best way for your ideas to come to us as opposed to talking about them one by one now.

If the board likes this, you could give it to us as one of your recommendations.

>> Fred, you'll start working on the wording for that.

>> Fred: Debbie already has a copy of this that I sent her and I just wanted to make the board aware.

>> We as the board want to see it --

>> Fred: You bet, I'll work on that right now.

>> Just to confirm the first one you had about the short-term facilities also being adoption facilities, that is the current situation, correct?

>> Yes.

>> Fred, we're going to consider that done.

>> Thank you for the suggestion and it's done.

>> Fred: One more thing before we go.

We're on track to meet our adoption goal.

We're on track to almost double that with adoptions.

So the numbers are going up.

And thanks, John, because Mustang Heritage Foundation is a big part of that.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: Do we have a report from the ecosanctuary BLM formed working group.

>> I don't think Zach is prepared to do a report necessarily since we're the lead on that unless less there's something you want to share

>> Zach, if you wouldn't mind just kind of doing -- maybe everybody else knew this and I didn't. But just kind of an update on how many ecosanctuaries we've got, number of horses that are in them and was on the horizon with those if you wouldn't mind doing that.

The reason I ask that is Zach and I had a conversation sometime this last week a little bit and maybe everybody else knows

>> Zach: I keep wanting to go to that mic.

Currently we have two ecosanctuaries, one in deerwood that's called deerwood and it is in the centennial valley next to the centennial valley in Wyoming.

That has approximately 300 animals on it.

Those animals are removed from Wyoming and we put back into the facility as part of an agreement that we made with the field office at the time.

That is going strong.

It's been a very positive experience for us and for the actual participants themselves, our partner.

There is a second one that was just awarded, within the last couple months that is taking place in Oklahoma, Colgate, Oklahoma, that has the capacity for 150 animals.

There are 150 animals there now.

It is just starting to come on line, they're starting to get their marketing set up and trying to come up with ideas on how to educate the public and so on and so forth.

There was another proposal under consideration and under renew.

Unfortunately, it wasn't going to be a program that was cost effective and therefore -- there were other things that made it not in the best interests of the government to proceed with and the American people.

So we decided not to move forward with that proposal.

There is a third one that is currently under consideration that's located just outside of lander.

It is going to be another fairly -- and I don't want to insult anyone but a fairly small number of animals between 100 and 167 I believe is what it was determined they could actually hold on the facility itself.

So we're still in the process of working with that individual and talking to them and making a determination so that we can move forward or not.

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: So then are there any others in the pipeline?

>> Zach: There was still one that is under consideration and that's the one from a solicitation



from -- I believe it was about three years ago that was a public and private ecosanctuary.

There are a number -- there's a very complex proposal.

There are a number of complexities involved with the various different legal requirements under the different acts and laws that we have to operate within.

And so that is still under consideration.

And it's going through an environmental impact statement to analyze the kind of the environmental risks and other things associated with potentially moving forward with that.

Once the environmental assessment is complete, the TPEC will then look at all the other things associated with it such as cost, you know, their marketing plan, the infrastructure that's up.

And then make a determination based on that whether or not to move forward or award that or enter into a partnership.

As a follow-up to that, at this point we've not made a determination or at least I haven't been given any direction to move forward at this time in looking at soliciting any further ecosanctuaries.

It doesn't mean it couldn't happen.

We can solicit them fairly quickly.

We have a template to do that.

But at this point we're just trying to get the others ones that we've had open, analyzed and either awarded or declined.

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: John, I need you to use your microphone.

>> John Falen: The one in Montana we talked about this morning.

I got everyone's attention there.

Does it have possibilities or -- it's got -- he said he'd run up to a thousand horses

>> Zach: Right.

Well, just so the process is clear and everybody understands the process, there is a -- the potential for the Bureau of Land Management to accept or at least look into what are called up solicited proposals.

Generally those are fairly hard to award because they don't meet the competition requirements in order to ensure that we're actually getting the best bang for the buck.

Other than that, the only other way to award these things is generally for the Bureau of Land Management to go out with a formal solicitation, open it up for an open and competitive -- you know, proposal period where they submit.

They are reviewed and then awarded.

And we do not currently have an open request for application so that they can participate in that process.

>> John: Go ahead and get hold of him and explain what he needs to do to get in the pipeline, huh.

>> Zach: I'll explain to him exactly what we just talked about here that he either has to submit it under --

>> John: I didn't know anything about him.

All he did is just call me

>> Zach: Yes, sir, I have his number and I follow up fairly regularly with individuals who want to talk about short-term holding or ecosanctuary --

>> John: Thanks, Zach.

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: So two questions if I might.  
The one going through the EIS, where is it located or the EEA or whatever.  
The environmental assessment that's still in the pipeline.  
>> It's in Elko outside of Wells and involves a number of different go chutes.  
I believe it's antelope valley and another HMA that's slipping my mind at this time  
>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: What part of the process is it in at this point?  
That's been ongoing for a couple years.  
>> I think we alluded to the fact that environmental impact statements take a while.  
>> I want to know where it's at within this process.  
>> At this point they're still trying to get information from the applicant as to the recreation plan, what they intend to do on the public lands to refine that so that we can better come up with the different alternatives that need to be analyzed.  
It's fairly young in the process still.  
There are a number of hurdles that we've had to jump over in order to get the information that we need in order to assess the -- well, one, develop the different alternatives.  
That has been done.  
But then also look at you now, look at the impact.  
So it's been long and there's been some other issues as well.  
But I'll have to check on that.  
And there's a project manager that has been assigned to it that's been shepherding it through the process.  
He works for the state and the state office or actually works for the Elko office.  
They do not work for us.  
So they've kind of been walking it through the process.  
So I'd have to check back and see where they are.  
>> I'll save my other part for my recommendation.  
>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: I think we've already had advisory board discussion.  
Spilled over into the working group report.  
So at this point we can open it for discussion.  
And accept or reject any recommendations coming from board members.  
>> TIM HARVEY: That will be cut and cry.  
The ones I wrote down here are asking Fred if -- Fred is not here, so let's appoint him.  
I sat on the volunteer board just as Julie left.  
Fred would be a much more appropriate choice for that if he'd be willing to take that on the volunteerism.  
He's really connected with that.  
He's already doing it.  
He's involved with that kind of stuff.  
And he's real good at it.  
I would like to ask Fred to take my place on there and I'd step down and the other is just to make sure I'm tagged back on to that population growth suppression subcommittee.  
And Fred will have to sprinkle holy water on that.  
Population growth suppression.  
We don't have a working monitor up here so we can't see.

Fred, you've been recommended to be on the volunteerism committee or working group.

>> I volunteered you.

>> Fred: I accept.

>> Thank you, sir.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: Do we have any other recommendations from other board members?

We're opening it up for recommendations

>> I have two.

>> The first one that I'd like to do is I'd like the board to recommend to the BLM management that they do what they need to do to furnish the tools to the district offices and the district specialists to manage their herds.

You know, that's what Scott was talking about yesterday.

For us to be sure that he has the tools he needs.

You know what I'm saying?

We can say we're redoubling the emphasis on the need to make sure that all the tools are available.

I'm pretty sure that recommendation has been given in the past.

>> Some tools need to be developed still.

>> Some do.

But I think we're recommending that all the tools become available.

>> Well, part of the thing I'm hearing from board members that's been here way longer than me there's been recommendations made in the past and nothing has been done?

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: That's one issue I'm going to address before we're done.

>> Might be the last time Scott leads a tour.

>> Did you have a second one.

>> What else did Scott say yesterday?

>> Believe me, I didn't do everything Scott said.

>> Mr. Chairman, are we on record of establishing a regular time of series of conference call for the board and our working groups?

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: We haven't.

We set it for the monthly updates from the BLM to the board.

But we've not set scheduled for working groups

>> Working groups don't need to be scheduled but I think if we have any developments that arise that are relevant to those working groups we should be able to organize them and I have no idea to do that.

>> I think we have that capability now to do that.

>> The ones it's a BLM-formed group when something comes up Dean has been really good when he had something up with the comprehensive animal welfare program, he'll notify us. I think the onus is on individual group members to -- some of the things I'm involved with because I get caught up in one and I prioritize that over the other.

So I think that maybe touching base with each other a little more often.

I think you and I could do something pretty cool of getting that Web site thing, maybe getting something out that we could stimulate that.

There's other ways besides just conference calls

>> We're doing these conference calls for the working groups.  
 I thought I heard, if I'm not mistaken that we could if we wanted to incorporate some outside folks, too.  
 Is that what you said.  
 >> I don't know about that.  
 >> JOAN GUILFOYLE: Under tab 8 there's rules about how groups work so I would refer you to that.  
 Depends if it's advisory board or BLM formed working group so it's laid out here.  
 We can all review it here.  
 I do not see in here that there's a mechanism for you to -- the working group to consult.  
 With people who were not on the board.  
 >> Would it be a problem if we needed advice on in order for us to work something up?  
 I know with all the --  
 >> JOAN GUILFOYLE: It isn't addressed here, Tim, and this was put together by the person who used to be in charge. 2012 is when we put this together so everyone knew what the rules were.  
 It's not addressed here.  
 So let's take another look at that question.  
 >> TIM HARVEY: Joan set up for us to use the conference call system for the working groups.  
 >> Fred: I heard that but I don't have anything  
 >> Tim Harvey: That was before you came  
 >> Fred: Because I'm new?  
 I'm of the opinion and I know Joan said you'd look at it again.  
 But, if it don't say can't,  
 >> JOAN GUILFOYLE: It does say solely.  
 And I had somebody asked me that during one of the breaks, how they could be involved.  
 And I guess my thoughts if we can get peopleCALLIE, you know, like Tim said somebody with special expertise and we as the committee wanted to talk to them about it, I think we could.  
 But norm way to handle it is that we gather as individual committee members, we gather that information from whoever it is that's wanting -- either they want to provide that information to us or we want to get that information from them, we can get that and share it with the committee.  
 I think we can deal with that  
 >> TIM HARVEY: If there's folks out here who want to help out and offer some discussions.  
 One of the things we have our work.  
 Is it appropriate -- let me ask this question: Is it appropriate for our working groups to be posted or somehow for the public to know what our working groups are to have a posting of it that if people have an email, Dropbox or whatever.  
 An opinion of any of our working groups, would there be a way for folks out here to contribute to the working group so we're like a triage to go through things and help assimilate some information back to the --  
 >> well, you know, they have that right now.  
 They have a list out there of everybody's email on the Web site.  
 But let me finish.

And so, if they have something about volunteerism or something, they can forward that email to the chairman and he can put it out to the individual groups.

>> TIM HARVEY: What I'm trying to do is come up with a that has a list of the working group and what the goal of the working group is and they can click on that.

>> On the Web site?

>> TIM HARVEY: You know what I'm saying to make it an easier process.

Not everybody is computer savvy.

I get in and mess around with my computer and I have to take it down to the person who fixes them to get it squared away again

>> Greg, with your experience, do you have any intelligence on this because I don't.

If you don't, we will look into the question.

>> Greg Shoop: I don't.

About seeking input, I'm not sure.

In terms of who can participate in the groups, in the subcommittees.

It's -- the subcommittee, you can go out and find -- you can go out and get information, you can talk to anybody you need to talk to to get information and help -- to help you consider the problem that you're considering.

I think of it like Congressional committees and their subcommittees and they have hearings and bring in witnesses.

It's just that the group itself is limited to the members of the advisory board.

But you can work with other people to get information and kick around ideas and --

>> I'm just thinking an invitation not just have the vehicle there, but also have it as an invitation that you know what, I really think it's important that the stakeholders and whether it be the ranchers or the advocates or just interested public person not associated with anybody, you never know where your best ideas might come from and some of my best ideas were given to me by other folks?

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: You want to look at what I just captured.

>> TIM HARVEY: I can't read that at the angle I'm at.

>> Fred: Just like if we had a question about AML, this gentlemen would have been a good person to talk to about that.

If we're working as a working group it would be good to call him and say explain ALMs to us. Right?

Steve was talking about papers to be established I was thinking if this comes out and there in a newly published paper, this would be nice if this affects the resources subcommittee working group to say hey, can we get on a conference call and have you explain what this is about that you just published.

That's the kind type of thing I'm thinking about.

>> They can understand me.

>> Kathie asked us to read that at the same time.

>> It's important that it's a vehicle that allows people to communicate with us.

Not just a statement of what we're doing but allows people to contribute to -- you know, to contribute to the movement of what we're doing.

Would it be as simple as these are the participants if you want to provide suggestions on this topic, send them --

>> absolutely could be that simple but I think you need to have a statement or a place, one place they can go and say here's the advisory board subcommittees.

Here's what they're working on.

If you want to communicate with them, here's who they are.

It could be as simple as that but it needs to be an invitation of some sort

>> Is there a place on the Web site for public comments.

>> I do not know the answer to that.

We don't -- my office doesn't manage the Web site and I don't happen to know the answer.

Sarah, do you know?

Here's one thing I do know is that in the Federal Register notice, people are invited to submit public comments through the wild horse.gov email which we translate to you, I do know that.

Do you know anything about what's on the Web site, Sarah.

>> Is there a place for public comment on the Web site?

>> I was thinking that might be the vehicle for people to be able to submit information not a public comment addressed to a certain, working group if in fact that working group and its duties were published.

>> Well, that definitely is not there.

Because this is -- this is an idea you're generating right now.

So that piece is definitely not there.

I thought you meant as public comment

>> That's what I was thinking is that if -- you know, if the working groups --

>> what did Rick say.

>> Rick Danvir: I was saying if you put a statement on the Web site and just say if you would like to make suggestions on this topic and this workshop topic, contact one of these members.

>> So language I had written down is provide links for the public to use to communicate with working groups on specific issues they're looking into.

>> We don't need to provide links.

Just -- you know, inviting them if they want to participate in that particular toping for a working group that you contact members and those e-mails available.

>> Yeah, if they list our names and here's the working group members and the email link and you click on it, there you go.

Wouldn't take up a lot of -- what do they call that stuff.

>> Time?

>> TIM HARVEY: The other stuff.

The space on the Internet, what they call it.

>> I think Kathie has captured what we're looking for, Zach.

>> I think that's the recommendation right there.

>> Does anybody have an issue with this recommendation.

>> I like it.

Do you have approval of that, Fred?

>> We're listening to you.

>> This other one that you had me write down I don't have to say so people can make fun of the way I talk.

>> Does your accent carry through your written word?

>> I don't have an accent.

>> In Arkansas you don't, but here you sure do.

>> I'm assuming if no one has an objection to this recommendation, we'll forward it to the BLM.

Okay.

Any further suggestions or proposals from recommendations?

I've got one.

I'll let you go first

>> Discretion of the chair.

>> It might be as much of a question might be discussion first.

Okay.

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: So -- and this may be there, Joan, I don't know, sorry for not doing my homework before.

But an on range FAQ sheet that talks specifically about the ecological cost, I mean, I don't think there's anything about the cost but is there a way to develop a FAQ sheet that's really focused on the ecological impacts, let's just say it that way?

A quick paper that talked about what Dr. Peterson said basically is what I'm thinking, whether it's horses or anything else, here's the here's how the grazing management works and plants work and that kind of stuff

>> Do you mean a FAQ sheet of the way we monitor that explain more what you wanted to say?

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: Put everything Dr. Peterson said today in one page.

>> Maybe it's easier to understand

>> Your recommendation could be to him to let's wait until a couple of those white paper studies have come out and we'll come back from the resource group in the future for a recommendation.

>> Okay.

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: That's enough of that. What's the potential forever again, discussion, not recommendation, so when these research papers come out such as this one and I'm sure there will be others that will be -- what's the potential for that being posted on BLM's Web site.

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: That's an easy one, Callie.

We have a library of published research that the BLM operates out of its national operations center, it's on the web.

So yes, we can send it to them and they will have it posted there

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: But can we have it posted on the wild horse page if it's pertaining to resources or the horses but in particular the resources, can we kind of make a focus area, a link if nothing else.

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: We will definitely look into it so people can find it.

That's the point.

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: That's the key.

>> So Kathie, accepting that without a formal recommendation

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: You're asking if we need a recommendation and I'm saying yes, we'll do it.

But we're a little ahead of our

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: Do we need it as a real recommendation, if we do, then let's do it if not, I don't need it.

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: I have things I write down as action items for myself that are independent so we can leave it there if you don't want to make a formal recommendation.

>> You want us to put a link on the wild horse page to the library where those research papers are posted?

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: That may already be there.

Okay. Any other representations from boards or board members and/or working groups

>> Nothing you want to hear right now.

>> Okay.

I do have -- you got one more.

>> I know HSUS had done a report or research on sand wash or one of the other cedar or something or another.

Cedar mountain, has BLM received that report.

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: No, I don't believe they published it yet.

Last time we spoke with them it had not yet been published

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: Okay.

we need that research.

Do we need to do something to make a recommendation we get that?

Is there anything the board can do to speed that up?

Because in my opinion, that was research that's what done now it's been -- isn't it two years old?

We need that report.

>> Volunteering to answer and maybe you can give us is that right, Boyd, the status of the publication of that research?

Stephanie, thank you.

You're probably the one who has the draft on their desk and it's waiting to go out or something.

>> Thank you for the question, Callie.

The sand wash paper is being written right now by Allen and our group and we should be submitting it for publication to I journal this year.

We'll finish Cedars pending funding.

To finish it next year and then we'll -- we will write the paper for Cedars next year and publish it next year.

>> Okay.

Can I -- go ahead and ask questions.

>> So because it was a BLM funded paper, does BLM get that report before it goes published.

>> It was not funded by BLM.

It was funded by the Annenberg foundation

>> The one on the sand wash was.

>> Both of them.

We just cooperated with providing the HMA and the animals and it was funded by Annenberg and it was an HSUS-led piece of research



>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: So that will be published when.

>> We hope sand wash will be published next year, it's being written down and we'll submit it for publication and it takes six months to a year to get it published once you submit it for publication and we should write Cedars and submit it for publication next year.

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: Okay.

looking forward to that

>> So are we?

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: Thank you.

I rest my case.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: Okay.

my recommendation is based on the fact that this board over the years has made a lot of recommendations.

I'm sure that we've duplicated trlicated a number of those.

You've got -- you've already got it.

>> Yeah, I can preempt you on this one if you like.

I think I know what he's going to say, but whatever your pleasure is, sir

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: My recommendation is that we have access to those historical recommendations and it's pretty enlightening, I saw a partial list of that last year and it's enlightening.

What this board has recommended over the years

>> Since you made that recommendation at the April meeting, I think this is where it came up, we did go back and find and turn into an Excel document every single recommendation that was ever come in to us from the board since 1998.

There were 241 of them.

And my staff worked very hard to kind of update is it accepted par partially accepted, fully completed to figure out status.

They finished this probably two or three days before this meeting.

And I never had a chance to look at it and think it would be sorted a different way, sorted chronologically right now for the value of what we've done, we'll sort it.

It's an Excel document.

You can do that.

You can plan on at least presenting this next April to you and if you want to get updated on a monthly phone call, we can do that

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: Would it be possible when you respond to our recommendations in a month?

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: Possibly.

Possibly in a month we could look at it we're going back in time quite a bit so we want toic ma sure we're accurate about what the board did in 1998 and 2,000.

Because there aren't that many of us who were there then.

So I think we could definitely try for that to have it back to you.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: Then I'm preempting.

>> You could go ahead and make representationle recommendation so we'd have it on record.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: If we feel it's necessary as a board.

We're having the BLM provide an inventory of past historical recommendations from the wild

horse advisory board to the BLM and if possible status and whether it was accepted or not.  
Do people feel comfortable with that.

>> It was very interesting.

You'll have a chance

>> I think it would be a good exercise.

>> It was very interesting.

Let's consider that our 5<sup>th</sup> recommendation.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: Okay. Do we have any further --

>> yeah, there's a couple things to hit on

>> TIM HARVEY: There was a question I had, I wanted to check my notes and wanted to make sure we hit it because we don't get another day.

PZP talking about budgets.

I made a note to ask you before we left today is -- is there any plan for -- I know that you're -- the gatherers right now are only being done for off of private land complaints. Court order, that kind of thing.

But is there any gathering activity planned for administering PZP, especially booster situations where you've started to get things under control and I'm just thinking you know, it's like pushing a car and getting a car rolling when you're trying to push your car and you have to stop and start all over again.

But is there any plans for the BLM to just do catch and release of just to administer PZPs and can -- are there area that that would be a really appropriate tool right now granted not the silver bullet necessarily.

But is there any plan to do any of that and if not, I would like to -- I just thought maybe the board should make a recommendation that even if they got to try to reallocate funds to do it, it just makes sense to do some of that.

>> JUNE SEWING: I think I tried to say earlier but let me go into a little more detail about the planning for FY15, which is starting of course October 1.

We asked the field through state leads to submit to us there request to do any number of on range activities.

Could be just straight removal because of those two reasons.

It could be removal with PGS treatment, which might be PZP, probably would be.

It on catch and release.

It could be continuing to treat this year because we've been doing it for four years.

We'd love to be able to be the HMA that is ready to try a permanent sterilization method as a PGS tool and it might involve the removal.

Right not.

The field has been asked to send it in I can't remember the date but eminently and we'll look at requests, see what the numbers add up to and then work with leadership to prioritize them and approve them for FY15.

And to my mind, the ones that are retreatments that are PZP continuations that are perhaps new PZP that don't involve removals in my mind will rise to the top.

I have a team of people who really help us do that.

It isn't just my staff.

We take this list of proposed actions and I give it to a team of about seven people and they

analyze it and come back to me with their recommendations and then I go up above me and say here's my recommendation of the program.

And we get approval for it.

So yes, we know that's important and the field wants that so that's definitely part of the process we'll do forever.

Those would be less costly.

You've got less transportation issues.

You can do the treatment at a remote holding site but it doesn't have to be --

>> right.

There's two more things I'll just say I think are important.

If we do -- if the field wants to do a -- an action that does try to go to AML so it does have some removals but perhaps some animals being put back, we committed that every mare would be treated with PZP because we've got them, we may as well treat them and it have its effect for at least a year

>> TIM HARVEY: Anything there's any kind of recommendation involved.

That pretty much answers the question unless somebody else feels -- the only other thing I was going to ask you the next meeting is going to be on the East Coast and I would like to say publicly I'd like to see it down in Florida.

We usually go to Washington, D.C., and

>> Fred.

Of the I'd like to see it in Arkansas

>> TIM HARVEY: That's not east, listen to the way you talk, that's not east.

You mentioned the possibility of the federal prison program like the Gainesville has University of Florida close to the prison program and do the training and usually when we go east, we go to Washington and I thought it would be nice to do the southeast and April I can tell you Florida is a lot nicer than Boston area or something.

It's also a very horsey area and I think the presence of this activity there would be beneficial.

So I don't know how the other members feel but --

>> you want to make that in the form of a recommendation to the board.

>> We also discuss it but we just kind of talk about what we want to do the next meeting so I don't know that it needs to be a recommendation.

But I think if I said it out loud and somebody over there is taking notes it's semi official anyway

>> So just one qualification is that the federal Bureau of Prisons is definitely interested in partnering with us.

I have no idea how long that will take and where it would be next April so I can't --

>> that would adjusting the cherry on the icing on the cake.

>> It would be, definitely would be.

>> It's a real horsey community and there's a lot of people with mustangs down there and I think there's a lot of folks down there that would love to attend one of these meetings and because of where they are geographically, they really don't get the opportunity and I think it would be -- for an eastern meeting, it would be a pretty good option.

And I think it's pretty inexpensive to go there compared to some of the other places that we've been.

Special affairs guys down in Jackson it would be an opportunity for them to do a campaign in

that part of the country, you know, the advisory board is coming and here's what they do and here's the program and here are the problems and you know to try to pique the interest of the public that's in that horsey part of Florida

>> It wouldn't even a bad idea to coordinate some other satellite adoption and at same time frame or something like that.

You've got the interest there.

There are a lot of people there interested in horses in that area.

I used to live there six months out of the year

>> You'll be there in April.

>> I will be there in April.

You won't have to pay to fly me there.

It's only a 40 minute drive

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: I'd be happy to consider it and I'd see if any other board members have locations as well.

We have to do a Nancys between three areas we'd -- analysis to show that we'd use the time wisely.

If there are any locations in the east besides Florida

>> There might be other places besides Florida.

Jacksonville or --

>> you don't want to go way down to Miami.

>> I know that but that's three places.

>> Gainesville is nice, Jacksonville, you can fly in there easy and cheap.

>> And that's an important part of this is where we can -- we've got to fiscally responsible in our representations on that.

>> I know you can get a hotel for a whole lot less than what they charge for a hotel in Washington, D.C.

we did Oklahoma a year ago March just before you came on board, Rick.

Site facility and hotel.

So I'm not sure how we would do that since we don't have BLM people who have offices in Florida

>> I don't want to take anything away from Tim.

But Jackson Mississippi would be a BLM office there and they have a Piney Woods facility that we could tour.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: One thing to think about too is if you have -- just as a fiscal responsibility, you know, even going to Reno, you're not -- half your staff doesn't have to make the trip.

All those things have to go into consideration.

>> I realize that.

You can't pick a spot unless you realize it and put a pin.map

>> Are we going to talk -- are we going to leave that open to discussion or should we make some sort of recommendation to you.

>> I -- I mean, you can make a formal recommendation if you want to if the board wants to make a recommendation to it.

I will say that we will analyze it and see what the numbers look like and be in touch with you

about it if we have time

>> TIM HARVEY: If it's something you'd consider, I'll okay with that.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: You two more items.

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: I have a couple.

I keep having thoughts.

Actually Tim triggered it.

So in regards to the gathers and that kind of stuff and this next year's plan and when local offices make recommendations, if a local office and there's a group there that believes they could adopt all the horses that could be gathered, can we encourage letting that gather move forward because it's not going to be a holding situation, but, if there's a group that's worked hard and got people willing to adopt them from that herd management area, can we get that approved so that we can get the horses off the range and home?

>> You don't have to recommend that one, Callie because we're already doing that.

One thing I was going to say about this year is one thing that has shifted is that the states have agreed to do all they can do in the field to have the animals that they feel do need to be removed not go into holding.

Which means they work with local groups.

They feel that they are definitely good candidates for adoption or sale.

And they kind of make that promise to us that you know, if you'll allow us to remove these 30 animals here, we really feel that we can get them adopted.

We approved an extra adoption just like that in Utah about a month ago.

We've already got an agreement that before the states accepted in their list, their list of actions that they want to do, that don't go into long-term holding which is one of the big issues, you know, we will -- we will take them at their word and those will be approved so yes, local people working with local groups to -- and there's other things that they've agreed to do that they think they should be doing as opposed they're doing everything they can to keep them from going into holding so the answer is yes

>> So my understanding is in Colorado there was one turned down this year in that situation, so I'm glad to hear that's the case and let's move forward.

>> Here's one other piece that you should know.

All the field offices in the state send in their proposals to the state office to the state lead.

The state also get to prioritize what they accepted to us.

So I don't know of the one in Colorado you're talking about and we can talk on the side if you'd like.

But we get from each of the states what their priorities are and that's what goes in the mix.

So there's another layer of prioritization

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: Okay. Appreciate that.

Let's do visit about that one.

The other and I promise it will be my final.

Back to the ecosanctuaries and Zach and I talked a little bit about this.

I would like to have -- before BLM goes out with another proposal for ecosanctuaries, I think we need to look at the costs involved in getting there.

Getting one approved if it's only going to be for 150 head of horses or something, the time of the staff time and that kind of thing.

Just look at it.

It may be worthwhile but let's do a -- what do you call it -- let's not do a study.

A cost/benefit analysis, there you go.

Just a quick cost/benefit analysis.

It appears to me that we've been a long time lot of process, lot of time to get to two that are approved that have a total of 400 head of horses and staff resources might have been better used somewhere else.

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: I did ask Zach to come up and talk because he is an expert on agreements and contracts.

Just like the long term pasture solicitation that we talked about that we reduced the minimum to 100 animals, cast the net widely and you have to go through a process to decide if they're suitable for animals and have or can put in the right infrastructure, et cetera.

That's part of how you decide where the opportunities are.

So my guess is you have to do the same thing with an ecosanctuary, you cast the net wide and see what comes in.

I think our original proposals for all three that came in on the last solicitation were 150 animals each, is that right?

Is that what I'm remembering?

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: There was one that was originally set at 300.

One that was around 2 or 250.

And then one that was around 150.

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: We went through the process.

Give your thoughts on would you want to not look for fear.

I think the staff time you just have to invest it to look.

But --

>> When we go through the process of looking at and reviewing an assistance agreement proposal, one of the biggest things we look at and one of the bars we use is the cost fair and is it reasonable.

And is it fair and reasonable not necessarily but we have to take into consideration the geographical location.

The staff time and things like that for performing NEPA analysis, we generally don't factor into the equation.

It can be labor intensive.

But, if the cost of -- and I understand where you're coming from and maybe it is something that we can work on but, if the cost of putting an animal into an ecosanctuary reduces the cost of the government by one -- a dollar per day per head, over a number of years that adds up and the economy of scale is there.

There's also a certain amount of uncertainty when we do look at some of the proposals based on the return on -- you know, the marketing plan that's submitted by the individual and whether or not they have the ability to bring in revenue that potentially needs to come back into agreement to defer the cost to the government.

So, if you have a very successful business plan, marketing plan, it can -- the total cost could be quite high but after they bring in the revenue and everything, then it ends up dropping the cost and then it's actually observed to the government or by the government.

>> Boyd Spratling: You're making a recommendation?

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: Yes, my recommendation would be that let's put it this way. Before another request for proposal -- is it request for proposal, is that the right terminology >> Applications?

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: Request for application goes out, that the subcommittee meet and have a conversation to discuss some of these pros and cons.

>> The working group.

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: Yeah, that supp committee that's a BLM formed group.

>> A phone conference.

>> Correct.

And that's been our intention.

>> Thank you.

>> We're just asking that BLM to use the working group that they formed as intended. You want to make that recommendation?

>> I would support that.

That makes sense to me.

We have a working group.

>> I know.

>> But the question is do you want to support that?

>> Of course, I do.

Yeah.

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: Are you saying what you want that working group to look at or do you just want to put the language that do what they were intended to do.

>> Review the idea --

>> actually do a cost/benefit analysis or just want to --

>> CALLIE HENDRICKSON: I don't want to do another study, I really don't.

Let's just have -- asking to do what we should do

>> Meet with the working group.

>> Right.

And part of that -- I know it's been a couple years.

In the past there was conversation that no offense, Zach, I know you were behind and hurrying up to get that out the door but we did not get that opportunity and I want to make sure we have that opportunity before the conversation even really gets started next time.

>> The BLM will consult with members of the -- you know, the working group prior to and gather their input prior to administering or publishing another request for application.

>> TIM HARVEY: That sounds good.

It makes sense.

Of course, I just said it.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: Okay. That was our 6<sup>th</sup> recommendation.

>> Fred: I have one comment to make before we close and this is directed to Scott.

Based on the 5<sup>th</sup> recommendation that we are that when you gather a horse or a herd and you have them all adopted, that herd we looked at yesterday put my name on the top of the list for that gray horse.

Gotcha covered.

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: So Boyd, did the full committee accept this recommendation.

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: Yes, it did.

>> Greg, do you have a comment in closing?

>> Greg: This isn't on the agenda, this is an extra agenda item.

I asked Boyd if I could have a few minutes to make closing remarks.

I want to use that Reagan thing since I paid for the microphone, I get to.

Not entirely appropriate but what the heck, I wanted to thank Don as the state director and district managers who spent time with us the last couple days, Mark and Steve and Rick our field manager here in lander and Scott and Curtis and Sue and whoever else I'm forgetting. Amy and just the staff that you know the staff that spent your time with us the last couple days.

We really appreciate it.

It was really most helpful and we really do appreciate the time you spent with us.

So thank you.

I want to thank you guys because this is the last time we'll be -- I shouldn't say last time because who knows.

You never say never but for a while it's going to be the last time I get to work with you guys.

And it's been short, but it's been sweet and sincerely, I mentioned this at the end of last meeting, it's still true.

I really have enjoyed working with you guys.

You're a good group of people.

The best kind of people for us to work with because we're all kind of on a -- we're aligned in terms of the purpose that we're working on and it's really great to have your support in trying to solve this thing.

So I have a recommendation myself.

This is a personal recommendation.

I've been around the program now for not as long as some of you guys, but the -- it didn't take long to realize this is a complex problem.

You know, just some of the things we've been walking about the last couple days.

Tim and I have had conversations and maybe Fred too about you know, about we've got herd areas out there that have been zero'd out.

Can't we put horses back on those lands and why were they zeroed out and there's no simple answer to questions like that because it all depends on what that particular area was and what it's being used for and water, is there water available?

Because you don't want to put horses out where there's no water.

You know, so it's just -- it's like every time you get asked a question, there is no simple answer to the question.

And I think that's becoming more and more to you guys the longer you're around this it's just complex.

It's my personal belief that you always try to find simplicity in those problems because that's where -- that's the only way through complex issues is you've got to find something that's simple.

And there's -- there's been something that we've been looking at as we've been working on a long-term strategy for the program and we didn't talk about that at this meeting.



But we are working on a long-term strategy of the program.  
Been doing analysis on different alternatives and there's a particular chart and I don't remember if we used this at the last meeting.  
Did we display our hockey stick?  
May I use the back of we did this last time where we plotted out population projections over time if we don't do anything.  
If we don't do anything in terms of horse management and much like that climate change hockey stick thing that started that discussion?  
We've got our own hockey stick graph.  
The population grows like this and that's a problem.  
But I wanted to have that problem put into context.  
So I asked Dean I was curious because there is that cattle versus horse thing and why don't you take the cows off and leave it to horses and you've got all this acreage out there that's available.  
Why not leave it not horses.  
I said Dean, rough newspaper here because we don't have -- it's not an exact science but what if we took the cattle off the HMAs and devoted those HMAs to horses, what's the carrying capacity approximately in round numbers, you know, for horses on those HMAs if we just did that.  
There's a line on that graph now and I don't want to -- we don't really need to talk about what the value is of that line because then we get into a discussion about whether the model is correct or not and it's quite simple.  
What is true is that wherever you draw that line if we don't do anything, the population exceeds the carrying capacity of those HMAs.  
You can pull the cattle off but, if we don't figure out how to manage the population of those horses, nature will do it for us.  
And it won't be pretty.  
We will have an ecological disaster and the horses will go where they want -- they will leave the HMAs and they'll go wherever they can find food and water and it's going to -- we know in BLM that we're looking at ecological disaster if we don't figure out that problem.  
So my conclusion is -- this is my opinion, that the fundamental problem that we're dealing with here --  
>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: We're going to have to -- let Greg speak.  
>> She needs to leave.  
>> Greg: So the fundamental --  
>> We're going to have to ask you to let Greg speak here.  
This isn't public -- so the fundamental problem we have to deal with in my opinion is population management.  
Everything else that we're working on are important.  
The balance of how we're allocating the use, all that, that's important in my opinion later.  
Because if we don't figure out how do we manage this population, all those other observations we've got bigger problems we're going to be talking about.  
So I would suggest to you guys that as you move forward on this, really keep the pressure on Joan and whoever's sitting in the seat behind me, you know, keep our eye on that ball.

You know, we've got to lick that problem.

That's all I have to say.

So other than that, so thank you all.

It's been a blast.

[APPLAUSE]

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: One last Wyoming comment we had long time members from 2000 to 2013 Gary Zokotonik, on my trip in. I want the board to realize you were represented by me giving a plaque to Gary for his 13 years of service on this board.

I'll email you a picture of the presentation out in front of his school bell that he's got in front of the yard.

So --

>> Boyd, if I may, I wanted to say a word of thanks to the staff who helped put on this meeting, Sarah, Kathie, Art, whoever Art's helper turned out to be, the other Sarah, Paul and Bob.

Thank you for making this work.

Can we do a round of applause for them?

They did a good job.

[APPLAUSE]

>> DR. BOYD SPRATLING: But the unfortunate thing is Gary worked for 13 years to get a meeting in Wyoming and the very time it happens, he's in Billings, Montana.

>> JOAN GUILFOYLE: Boyd, just a few more thank yous. Do you mind.

I wanted to thank Dr. Peterson for coming in.

I thought he did a great job of fundamentals, range management, thank you very, very much.

I wanted to say because you never know -- excuse me,

>> (off mic) Criminal mismanagement of the wide horses and burros, you should be ashamed of yourself.

We are disgusted.

You should be ashamed of yourself

>> Callie and June and Boyd, if you come back on the board next year, wonderful, if you don't for some reason, I want to thank you all for your service.

Callie, Boyd, and June, thank you so much for having served all the time that you did.

And we'll see next time.

Let's be done.